By the year 1914, there were over 700 Cretans in Chicopee, the majority of whom hailed from the Province of Hania, Crete. They marveled at their newly adopted and hospitable country and soon began to make plans to organize to better serve their interests. The upshot was that most of them stayed and eventually became American citizens.

Following the Balkan War and during the First World War, more than 50 young Cretans served in the United States Armed Forces.

Many other Cretans returned to their native land and served in the Greek Army.

On April 16, 1916, the Cretans of Chicopee presented a theatrical production entitled "Exosis Othonos" for philanthropic endeavors with great success.

Later that year a five-member committee was appointed to enroll members and thus organize the Cretan Community Association.

In 1918, the City of Chicopee invited the Greeks of the City to take part in the Fourth of July parade. The enrolled members, now 150 strong, called a meeting and voted to take part in the celebration. At this meeting a committee was appointed to run the elections of new officers and the first Board of Directors was elected of the Pancretan Society "Minos," also known as the Pancretan Union in America.

After the By-Laws were drawn up and approved, the Society, from then on, operated and functioned as a philanthropic and patriotic group. Ever since then, the American as well as the Greek Press has repeatedly described the good work accomplished by the Cretan Society. The City of Chicopee became known as "Creticopolis."

In the year 1922, the Cretan Society "Minos" founded an afternoon Greek School for the purpose of teaching the Greek language. With the aid of many projects, it was able to maintain and operate it properly.

At this time the Cretan Society had many members in other cities, such as Detroit, Cleveland, Akron, Brooklyn, Albany, New Haven, Hartford, Southbridge and in other parts of Western Massachusetts.

The Society assisted the efforts of the Greek War Relief by contributing monies and clothing for the refugees of Asia Minor. Through the unselfish and generous contribution of the Pancretan Association, health centers were established in Crete; the Venizelion Pancretan Sanitorium; the Rethymnon General Hospital; and the Canea General Hospital. Through the years the Cretan Brotherhood of Minos-Crete have contributed more than $28,000 for the fulfillment of these worthwhile causes and many thousands of dollars more to other charities.

Our local Cretan Society played an important role in the establishment of the American Pancretan Union in 1929. Mr. Erinakis was sent as representative of our association to convey the decisions of our members and contribute his efforts towards uniting the Cretans in America. In 1929 when the various Cretan Fraternities united, establishing the Pancretan Union, our Association was one of the first to join and remains so to this day, drawing its membership from Western Massachusetts. Our representatives to the First National Conference in Chicago had a big part in giving the English name to our National Organization. Since then our group has been known as the Cretan Brotherhood, "Minos" Chapter of the Pancretan Union in America.

In the year 1944, the members decided to move the center of our organization to Springfield, Massachusetts, where a Charter was also acquired. This was done because most of the members had relocated in this area.

In the year 1946, all the Cretans of the city were united into one Society known as the Cretan Association "Minos-Crete", Springfield, Massachusetts, a member of the Pancretan Association of America.

In 1947, the Association purchased the property on 37 Carew St. and after remodeling the buildings, the offices were moved there. The Minos-Crete Chapter was the first among Chapters to acquire its own club and property.

After 48 years of fruitful progress, our Brotherhood in Springfield has been given the chance to extend a warm greeting to our fellow Cretans, delegates and friends at the 19th Biennial National Pancretan Convention. Your Host Chapters, Minos-Crete and Proodos, hope your stay in our city a most enjoyable one.

CRETAN LADIES' SOCIETY, "PROODOS"

"Proodos", as we are known today, has an illustrious past with many of the Cretan Ladies of this area having played an important role in its formation. With headquarters at 37 Carew St. in Springfield, we are the product of the merger between the Chicopee Cretan Ladies Society "Ariadne" and the Springfield "Proodos." This merger took place on April 8, 1955 due to a Cretan population shift to Springfield.

Under the able guidance and inspiration of the past-presidents, this union brought about the fulfillment of many of the dreams of the Cretans . . . in helping the people of Crete.

Our women assisted in the establishments of health centers in Crete: The Venizelion Pancretan Sanatorium and The General Hospitals of Canea and Rethymnon. Through the cooperation of the Greek War Relief, contributions were sent to aid the War Orphans and Refugees of Crete and many other benevolences among them the Institution for the Blind.

Here, in Springfield, we assisted in the beautification of our church, The St. George Greek Orthodox Memorial Church. To promote the future growth of our community, "Proodos" was the first Greek organization in this area to sponsor a benefit for the St. George Building Fund.

On June 1, 1960, "Proodos" became a member of the Pancretan Association of America, thus enabling us, six years later, to be your convention host.

In tracing the history before the merger of 1955, we note the following:

Many years after the establishment of the Men's Cretan Organization "Minos" in Chicopee, the Cretan Ladies of this area decided to unite to better their way of life in their adopted country, to perpetuate their traditions and to help the less fortunate among them. Thus, on June 29, 1931 a committee was formed to enroll members and the first meeting was held on August 1, 1931. In order to perpetuate the Greek tongue and Orthodox religion among our children, the Council assisted in the first afternoon Greek School that was founded in Western Massachusetts.

Also, during the depression years, help was extended to our needy countrymen in various ways.

A few years later, in near-by Springfield, this same Cretan spirit of endeavor was aroused . . . the need for closer ties among themselves. Therefore, on Jan. 28, 1934, the Cretan Ladies Society of Springfield "Proodos" was founded.

At their first meeting the council elected as Officers; Mrs. K. Lionakis (Pres.), Miss M. Louvitakis (V. Pres.), Mrs. J. Metzidakis (Sec.) and Mrs. G. Cavros (Treas.).

Constitution and By-Laws were complied to which we adhere to this day with the exception of new amendments.

The Cretan Ladies carried on the vigorous traditions of their Cretan past, thus creating the Cretan Ladies' Societies that merged to form our "Proodos" of today.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Let us come before His presence with thanksgiving.—Psalm 95: 2.

Let Thy presence be revealed to us, our Father, as in this quiet moment of prayer we wait upon Thee.

Strengthen us by Thy spirit that no trouble may overcome us, no difficulty may overwhelm us, and no duty may overtax us, but may we now and always be equal to every experience, ready for every responsibility, and adequate for every activity. Help us to be more positive in our thinking, to look increasingly on the bright side of life, to be awake to the good everywhere present, and to be ever grateful for Thy gifts to us and for the love which surrounds us all our lives.

This day help us to live our faith, to rejoice in Thy presence, to maintain an attitude of good will toward all Thy children, to learn to forget ourselves, and to serve our Nation and our people faithfully and well. Take Thou Thy rightful place in our hearts—for in Thee alone is peace and joy and life. 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, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10327. An act to require operators of ocean cruises by water between the United States, its possessions and territories, and foreign countries to file evidence of financial security and other information.

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

S. 3158. An act to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; and

S. 3418. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964 AMENDMENTS

Mr. PATMAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3700) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

EXPANSION OF THE PURCHASING AUTHORITY OF THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. PATMAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3688) to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction.

AMENDING TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE—MAILING PRIVILEGES OF ARMED FORCES AND OVERSEAS PERSONNEL

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13448) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes, together with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORRISON, DULSKI, and CORBETT.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT—COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on August 19, 1966, considered and unanimously approved the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication and referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

WATERSHED, STATE, AND EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

Batavia Kill, New York, 2583, 89th Congress.
Caney Bayou, Arkansas, 2583, 89th Congress.
Chicod Creek, North Carolina, 2583, 89th Congress.
Cocodrie-Grand Louis, Louisiana, 2583, 89th Congress.
Crow Creek, Tennessee and Alabama, 2583, 89th Congress.
Dane Ridge, Iowa, 2583, 89th Congress.
Dead River, New Hampshire, 2583, 89th Congress.
Deer Creek, Iowa, 2583, 89th Congress.
Dry Creek, Mississippi, 2583, 89th Congress.
Duralde-Des Cannes, Louisiana, 2583, 89th Congress.
Durgens Creek, Missouri, 2583, 89th Congress.
Dutchman Creek, North Carolina, 2583, 89th Congress.
East Side Green River, Washington, 2583, 89th Congress.
Fox Creek, Kentucky, Kentucky, 2583, 89th Congress.
Fort Pierce Farms Drainage District, Florida, 2583, 89th Congress.
Gant Creek, Iowa, 2583, 89th Congress.
Holliday Creek, Mississippi, 2583, 89th Congress.
Home Cypress Bayou, Mississippi, 2583, 89th Congress.
Irish Creek, Kansas, 2583, 89th Congress.
Kona, Hawaii, Hawaii, 2583, 89th Congress.
Lewis-Hunsacker Creek, Tennessee, 2583, 89th Congress.
Little Contentnea Creek, North Carolina, 2583, 89th Congress.
Little Yadkin River, North Carolina, 2583, 89th Congress.
Lower Amazon and Flat Creek, Oregon, 2583, 89th Congress.
Mission Creek, Nebr. & Kansas, 2583, 89th Congress.
North Black Vermillion, Kansas, 2583, 89th Congress.
North Fork of Ozan Creek, Arkansas, 2583, 89th Congress.
Norwalk River, Connecticut, 2583, 89th Congress.
Otter Creek, Oklahoma, 2583, 89th Congress.
Palatlakaha River, Florida, 2583, 89th Congress.
Seven Mile Creek, Illinois, 2583, 89th Congress.
Spring Creek, Nebraska, 2583, 89th Congress.
Upper Buffalo Creek, West Virginia, 2583, 89th Congress.
West Side Green River, Washington, 2583, 89th Congress.
White River Backwater, Arkansas, 2583, 89th Congress.
Willow Creek, Missouri, 2583, 89th Congress.
Beardsley, California, 1532, 89th Congress.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD L. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. 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. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the reckless spending under the poverty program has become a matter of common concern. Yet it appears that demand for realism in this area continue to be unheeded. There is, of course, one sure cure and that is to cut down on the amount of money appropriated for the program. These cuts I have supported, and I find continuing justification for my votes. Nevertheless, it is disturbing to me that any program of the Government would make itself so vulnerable to charges of needless and reckless spending.

For instance, I am advised by the Honorable Thomas Beasley, a distinguished Florida jurist, that on July 15, 1966, a bus load of people were sent to Pensacola under the Great Society program at the expense of the taxpayers, on which occasion money was provided them for shopping purposes. It was said that this was to give them the opportunity to buy something they had never owned before and that this would enrich their lives. Most people can think of a lot of things which they have never owned, and which might enrich their lives, but they do not expect the Government to pay for them.

Judge Beasley also states that on July 28, 1966, 130 people were sent to Tallahassee from Walton County on buses under the same program, where they remained overnight. The records show that hotel bills and all expenses of the trip were paid with Federal money. There were a number of adults who made the trip as chaperones and they were paid $1.50 per hour for the trip.

It would appear that much closer supervision and much stricter standards are going to be necessary if the poverty program is to achieve its avowed purpose of helping people who need help to find a way to rise above poverty.

MANPOWER PROGRAM OF SECRETARY McNAMARA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, the proposal made yesterday by Secretary McNamara before the VFW on our manpower program was the most realistic and constructive of any advanced to date.

During a period when the very flower of our young manhood has been uprooted from homes and families, hundreds of thousands of able-bodied young men have been left to roam the streets. Many of these have been in the forefront of the riots, burning and looting throughout the country.

Through elimination of minor technicalities and intensive specialized training, these men can be taught and trained to discharge their obligation to their Nation. Not only will this be accomplished, but they will be equipped mentally and physically to take their places in society on their return from their military tour.

Efforts, however sincere, to rehabilitate these young men, through Job Corps Centers, have not only failed, but have induced a distorted outlook as to their obligations to society in the minds of these boys.

I would be the last man in the House to advocate loading our Armed Forces with great numbers of deprived and semidelinquents. But with our vastly expanded forces, resasonable numbers of

such can be absorbed without diluting the caliber and morale of their units.

And, most importantly of all, these men would be subjected to a type of discipline which they so sorely need, and which has been so sorely lacking in past efforts at training and rehabilitation.

I commend the Secretary on his proposal, and pledge my wholehearted support toward implementing the most sensible program advanced thus far in the solution of a national problem.

PROMOTION OF HEALTH AND SAFETY IN METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINERAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8989) to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. POWELL, HOLLAND, DENT, PUCINSKI, DANIELS, O'HARA of Michigan, AYRES, QUIE, and ASHBROOK.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next the International Finance Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT IS WELCOME IN OKLAHOMA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the lame-duck Republican Governor of Oklahoma sent an insulting and discourteous telegram to the President of the United States asking the President to cancel a planned trip to Oklahoma. This shamed and shocked all Oklahoma. We want the world to know that the President of the United States, whoever he may be, will always be an honored and welcome visitor in Oklahoma, our ill-mannered Governor to the contrary notwithstanding.

VISIT OF PRESIDENT TO OKLAHOMA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe quite a few Oklahomans would join in sending our Governor an elementary book on good manners today—whatever their political application.

I am proud of the fact that the president of Oklahoma Northeast, Inc., an organization of chambers of commerce in all 16 counties of the Second Congressional District, last night sent our President a telegram joining the Oklahoma ordinance work authority and our congressional delegation in inviting the President to visit Oklahoma.

Most Oklahomans are united in their spirit of hospitality and would not deny that hospitality to the Nation's Chief Executive at any time.

Notwithstanding our Governor's discourtesy, I understand our President in his Oklahoma visit Friday is inviting the Governor and the entire Oklahoma congressional delegation—Democrats and Republicans alike—to join him during his visit.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague. I have found no disinclination on the part of the Governor of Oklahoma to go into any county which he desires to go into, despite the fact that he is a lameduck, and that this is an election year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman. I agree wholeheartedly with him.

RIOTS IN WASHINGTON

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 read an article in the Washington Post this morning relative to the rock-throwing riot that occurred in Northeast Washington on Monday night. Capt. Vernon Culpepper, of the Washington Police Department, was quoted as saying:

> The biggest contributing factor was the heat (85 degrees), the humidity (87 percent), and the fact that the youths live in hot, crowded public housing where sometimes you have as many roaches as people, in some of those places.

I should just like to point out that when this public housing was built it did not come equipped with roaches.

We cannot do anything about the heat and the humidity, but the people who live in this housing, which was new when they moved into it, can do something about the sanitary conditions.

Probably what this city needs, instead of a lot of people apologizing for riots, is an administrator of public housing such as we have in my district, who inspects it periodically. If the people do not keep it in proper shape, they find somewhere else to live.

I do not know what the people who go around apologizing want us to do next. I suppose they would like to get Congress to get a detail to go out and clean up for them. I for one am not going to volunteer.

REPRESENTATIVE ICHORD SPEAKS ON ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. ICHORD. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the Members received in their mail printed material from SANE in which my name, and alleged statements that I made, have received prominent attention. The material states:

> In a radio interview broadcast by the American Broadcasting Company on August 12 one of the committee's more 'liberal' members, Representative RICHARD ICHORD of Missouri, linked the hearings to antiwar "demonstrations" and made the unprovable assertion that such demonstrations lengthened the war.

I do not have a tape of that interview, Mr. Speaker, but since I was not quoted directly by SANE, I am certain that no statement I made was in error.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that the hearings just completed by the committee were not aimed at legitimate dissent. I may not agree with any particular demonstration but as long as it is a lawful exercise of freedom of assembly protected by the first amendment I will defend it as a legal right. However, the act of raising money, blood, and supplies for the Vietcong now killing the flower of our youth in Vietnam is not legitimate dissent.

The bill as reported by the full committee today contains no provision that has even the most remote connection to any right guaranteed a person under the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, such as freedom of speech, freedom of thought, and so forth.

I introduced in the committee amendments to remove any language that could possibly be criticized as violating the first amendment guarantees and these amendments were accepted by unanimous vote.

It has been the position of the Department of Justice that the present Department regulations and statutory legislation are sufficient to control and prohibit aid by certain American citizens to the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. But standing out like a "sore thumb" in the Department's argument is the fact that certain "hard core" Communist groups have sent money to a Czechoslovakian bank on two occasions to aid the Vietcong and there have been no prosecutions—and a decision has been made not to prosecute. The record of the hearings will show that under questionning, by me during the hearing, the Department has specifically admitted that under the present law any individual or group of individuals can repeatedly solicit and collect funds and blood for the

use of the Vietcong, the North Vietnamese, or any American enemy and there is no violation of law until there is an actual transmission. The present law is absolutely ineffectual as an examination of the statutes and the record of the Department clearly reveals. Under the present law there is no effective way of prohibiting transmission once the money has been raised. H.R. 12047 will effectively stop such activity in the very beginning by prescribing criminal penalties for the process of soliciting and collecting. I urge and I think I can safely predict the overwhelming passage of this legislation when it reaches the floor.

RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BILL SHOULD NOW BE BURIED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House held preliminary funeral services for S. 2934, the rural community development district bill.

Although not being privy to the reasons why the bill was suddenly removed from consideration by the House yesterday, I strongly suspect the main reason was simply that there are not enough votes in the House to pass it.

Strong bipartisan opposition has been in evidence since this bill was reported by the Committee on Agriculture on June 25 by a slim four-vote margin. The bill did not clear the Rules Committee until July 25 and then reportedly by a one-vote margin. It was then scheduled for floor action last week and then postponed until yesterday, when it was postponed again for what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] described as "good and sufficient reasons."

Yesterday the Committee on Appropriations also filed its conference report on H.R. 14596, the fiscal year 1967 Agriculture Department appropriation bill. In its report on this bill—House Report No. 1867—the conferees agreed to provide $637,000 for the Rural Community Development Service instead of the $2.5 million proposed by the Senate and the $3.4 million proposed by the administration. The conference report goes on to state:

> Expansion of this agency has not been approved by Congress.

Certainly these two actions yesterday—the House postponement of S. 2934 and the Appropriations Committee conference report—should be a clear message to the administration that the House does not and will not approve of the duplicating, overlapping, unnecessary, inflationary, bureaucracy-building rural community development legislation incorporated in S. 2934.

I take this occasion then to sincerely urge the leadership of the House to let S. 2934 rest in peace until next year.

IS THIS THE COUP DE GRACE?

Mr. MONAGAN. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to give the House notice of the hearings which the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property of the House Committee on Government Operations is presently conducting.

With these hearings, our subcommittee is trying to evaluate the accomplishments and effectiveness of the donable surplus property program of our Government. Under this vast program, Federal personal property which the Government no longer needs may be donated to qualified educational, public health, and civil defense agencies and organizations.

The magnitude of this program is reflected in the fact that in fiscal year 1966 more than $429 million in acquisition costs of property was approved for donation to the various eligible donees. It is safe to say that very few educational and public health institutions of significance in the country do not benefit from this program, and it is certain that many vocational and training facilities would be unable to conduct their present programs without the assistance of this donated property.

For this reason, and also because the Congress has frequently asserted its desire to keep this program vigorous and viable, the subcommittee has been greatly disturbed to learn of a recently declared policy change by the Department of Defense which generates approximately 90 percent of the donable property. This change bids fair to gravely restrict, if not strangle, the donable property program. The policy being changed concerns the use of the so-called exchange/sale authority of the Federal Property Act. Under this change, which by the way, the General Services Administration's new Governmentwide regulations on exchange/sale authority did not require the Defense Department to make, the Department will no longer make the bulk of its property available for donation prior to processing it for exchange/sale. There is much evidence that under the new DOD procedure, many common-use items which have been the backbone of the donable program will be sold or exchanged rather than donated to public institutions.

Testimony already received at the hearings of the Special Subcommittee demonstrates that many types of property which will now be sold or exchanged by the Department of Defense but which are needed by donee institutions, may bring less than a 10- or 15-percent return to the Government. When it is realized that in fiscal year 1965 expenses of sale of military surplus property amounted to 72.5 percent of the gross amount recovered, the desirability of this procedure must be seriously questioned.

It is true that hearings on the donation program have not been concluded and that information developed to date must continue to be evaluated. But it did seem to be desirable that the importance of these questions to institutions located in the districts of every Member of Congress, did warrant some notice to my colleagues in the House.

I hope that Members will reflect on these remarks and follow these hearings so that they can give the subcommittee the benefit of any suggestions, or advice, that they may have.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 237]

Adams	Hagan, Ga.	Purcell
Ashley	Halleck	Reid, N.Y.
Baring	Hansen, Iowa	Resnick
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Rivers, Alaska
Brock	Hathaway	Rooney, N.Y.
Cahill	Helstoski	Roudebush
Callaway	Horton	St. Onge
Celler	Irwin	Scheuer
Cohelan	Karth	Schisler
Conable	King, N.Y.	Schmidhauser
Conte	Landrum	Scott
Conyers	Long, Md.	Senner
Craley	Love	Sickles
Davis, Ga.	McCarthy	Stratton
Denton	McEwen	Sweeney
Diggs	McMillan	Thomas
Duncan, Oreg.	Martin, Ala.	Toll
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	Tuten
Flynt	May	Ullman
Ford,	Morrison	Walker, Miss.
William D.	Murray	White, Idaho
Fulton, Tenn.	O'Brien	Willis
Giaimo	Pepper	Wolff
Greigg	Pike	Zablocki
Grider	Poage	
Griffiths	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 357 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 15941, the Department of Defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION FOR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in

order any day next week to consider a joint resolution making continuing appropriations.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

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

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1867)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14596) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies 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 6, 13, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 32, 34, 43, 46, 47, and 51.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 30, 33, 36, 37, 39, 41, 44, 50, 52, and 54; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$123,402,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,169,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,580,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$80,263,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$51,113,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$58,740,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,132,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,511,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$51,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$165,855,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,218,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,502,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,412,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "of which $30,000,000 shall be placed in reserve to be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during the current fiscal year under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly development of the rural electrification program"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "of which $15,000,000 shall be placed in reserve to be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during the current fiscal year under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly development of the rural telephone program"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "of which $25,000,000 shall be placed in reserve to be used only to the extent required during the current fiscal year under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly conduct of the loan program"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,446,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 25 and 31.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
W. R. HULL, Jr.,
THOMAS G. MORRIS,
GEORGE MAHON,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
ODIN LANGEN,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the 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:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service

Amendments Nos. 1 through 4—Research: Appropriate $123,402,500 instead of $120,673,000 as proposed by the House and $123,844,600 as proposed by the Senate.

The amount agreed to includes $11,169,000 for planning and construction of facilities instead of $10,619,000 as proposed by the House and $11,869,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House includes: Southern Piedmont Research Center, $175,000; feasibility study at Rapid City, S. Dak., $25,000; laboratory-office facilities at

Canal Point, Fla., $100,000; and modernization of greenhouses at Beltsville, Md., $250,000.

The amount provided also includes increases of $356,600 for staffing research facilities and $2,644,000 for acceleration of research activities listed on pages 6 and 7 of the Senate report. The proposed Senate reduction of $1,435,600 for research activities was reduced to $821,100 by the conferees to provide for the retention of the following research facilities: Sheep breeding, Fort Wingate, N. Mex., $88,900; swine research, Miles City, Mont., $25,300; brucellosis research, St. Paul, Minn., $5,400; flax research, Brawley, Calif., $35,000, and Brookings, S. Dak., $21,500; cotton research, Brawley, Calif., $10,800; corn borer research, Ankeny, Iowa, $79,900; insect research, Brownsville, Tex., $22,000; soil and water conservation and engineering research, Auburn, Ala., $20,000; wind damage research, Blacksburg, Va., $2,000; wheat research, Peoria, Ill., $303,700.

The conferees agreed to the Senate language limiting future budget estimates for transfers from section 32 for research to $15,000,000.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriate $80,263,900 instead of $76,764,000 as proposed by the House and $81,498,200 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminate Senate language authorizing the use of $100,000 for planning. The increase includes an additional $2,047,000 for fire ant eradication and three-fourths of the amount for each project added by the Senate, except for the $100,000 for planning at Clifton, N.J. The conferees expect that the full $5,350,000 included for the fire ant eradication program and the funds added for the pink bollworm and bollweevil outbreak in California will be fully matched by funds from State and local sources.

Amendment No. 7—Special foreign currency program: Appropriates $4,500,000 instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Cooperative State Research Service

Amendments Nos. 8 through 11—Payments and expenses: Appropriate $58,740,000 instead of $55,227,000 as proposed by the House and $60,740,000 as proposed by the Senate, including increases of $3,000,000 for Hatch Act pay adjustments, $500,000 for cooperative forestry research, and $13,000 for administration.

Extension Service

Amendments Nos. 12 through 14—Payments to States and Puerto Rico: Appropriate $78,917,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $75,917,500 as proposed by the House. The increase of $3,000,000 is provided for pay adjustments needed to keep salaries in line with those in Federal and other related activities.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 15—Watershed protection: Appropriates $70,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $67,020,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill includes $980,000 for river basin surveys and $2,000,000 for work on Public Law 566 watersheds. The conferees also are in agreement that new planning starts should be restored to 100 in fiscal year 1967 and that new construction starts should be increased above 80 to the extent necessitated by the increase in construction funds included in the bill.

Amendment No. 16—Great Plains conservation program: Appropriates $18,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $16,112,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17—Resource conservation and development: Appropriates $4,574,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,347,000 as proposed by the House.

Economic Research Service

Amendment No. 18—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $12,132,000 instead of $12,032,000 as proposed by the House and $12,182,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes $50,000 for research in Appalachia, and $50,000 for studies of rural income and conditions.

Statistical Reporting Service

Amendment No. 19—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $13,511,750 instead of $13,272,000 as proposed by the House and $13,575,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes $121,500 for farm employment and wage data; $10,000 for estimates of mushroom production; $40,000 for reporting service in Nevada; $26,250 for Hawaii estimates; and $42,000 for estimates on cut flowers.

Consumer and Marketing Service

Amendment No. 20—Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs: Appropriates $83,881,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $82,757,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22—Special milk program: Provides a total of $104,000,000 instead of $103,000,000 as proposed by the House and $105,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount agreed to, $51,000,000 is provided by direct appropriation and $53,000,000 is provided by transfer from section 32 as originally proposed by the House.

As a result of action by the conferees, an additional $146,000,000 in section 32 funds will be returned to the Treasury. Further, funds available to section 32 will be sufficient to cover all program operations required by basic law in fiscal year 1967 and will provide a carryover balance of $300,000,000 into next year as permitted by law.

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24—School lunch program: Appropriate $165,855,000 instead of $157,000,000 as provided by the House and $169,500,000 as provided by the Senate. The amount agreed to will provide an average 5 cents per meal for 3,235.4 million lunches expected to be served in the coming school year.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—Food stamp program: Provide a total of $140,000,000, of which $110,000,000 is by direct appropriation and $30,000,000 is from unused prior year balances. The conferees have omitted from the bill the language included in Senate amendment No. 26 prohibiting the use of section 32 funds to finance this program in the future since such prohibition appears in the basic act. Those responsible for planning and financing this program should take account of this in the future.

Foreign Agricultural Service

Amendment No. 27—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $21,218,500 instead of $21,088,000 as proposed by the House and $21,349,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

Amendments Nos. 28 and 29—Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Appropriate $128,558,000 as proposed by the House instead of $130,424,500 as proposed by the Senate and authorizes a transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation of $75,803,600 as proposed by the House instead of $77,545,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31—Appalachian region conservation program: Appropriate $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,200,000 as proposed by the House and provides for the use of up to $1,375,000 of prior year balances.

Amendment No. 32—Cropland conversion program: Appropriates $7,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33—Cropland adjustment program: Appropriates $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $90,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Rural Community Development Service

Amendment No. 34—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $637,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. Expansion of this agency has not been approved by the Congress.

Packers and Stockyards Act

Amendment No. 35—Appropriates $2,502,000 instead of $2,400,000 as proposed by the House and $2,604,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Information

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $1,851,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,826,000 as proposed by the House and increase the amount available for the Yearbook of Agriculture.

National Agricultural Library

Amendment No. 38—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,412,500 instead of $2,147,000 as proposed by the House and $2,501,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendments Nos. 39 through 42—Loan authorizations: Authorize electrification loans of $375,000,000 and telephone loans of $117,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and reinstate contingency reserves in the amounts of $30,000,000 for electrification loans and $15,000,000 for telephone loans.

Amendment No. 43—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $12,202,000 as proposed by the House instead of $12,302,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Farmers Home Administration

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45—Direct loan account: Authorizes loans of $350,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $300,000,000 as proposed by the House, and reinstate contingency reserve in the amount of $25,000,000. The additional funds are to meet the ever expanding need for operating loans.

Amendment No. 46—Rural housing for domestic farm labor: Reinstates House language limiting financial assistance under this program to "public nonprofit organizations".

Amendment No. 47—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $51,057,000 as proposed by the House, including $400,000 for rural community development work in the field, instead of $51,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The purpose of the Farmers Home Administration and its predecessor agencies since the 1930's has been (1) to enable rural people with financial difficulties to get a new start in farming or to expand their existing operations to improve their economic position, and (2) through close personal contact and supervision to enable borrowers who have no other source of credit to learn the fundamentals of successful financial management so as to improve their financial position and eventually return them to other regular sources of credit. This close contact with borrowers has resulted in an outstanding repayment record by FHA borrowers. Under present conditions, this close supervision of borrowers may become even more important to the success of this program.

The managers on the part of the House agree that the Department should study the possibility of reducing administrative costs in this agency through simplifying billing and collection procedures. They recognize that follow-up advice and assistance is necessary for some borrowers, while for others direct billing and collection of repayments may be feasible, particularly in view of the recent purchase of a computer by this agency. The Department is encouraged to carefully review this situation and take steps to reduce costs but at the same time take care to maintain the continued excellent repayment record of FHA borrowers. The Department should also carefully review the results of the dispersal of appraisal activities to county offices to be

sure that the interests of both the borrower and the Government are adequately protected.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

Amendments Nos. 48 and 49—Administrative and operating expenses: Appropriate $8,446,000 instead of $8,342,000 as proposed by the House and $8,546,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorize the use of premium income for administrative and operating expenses in the amount of $4,100,000 instead of $4,150,000 as proposed by the House and $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendments Nos. 50 and 51—Reimbursement for net realized losses: Appropriate $3,555,855,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,500,000,000 as proposed by the House, and restores House language which prohibits Public Law 480 sales to nations which supply or transport goods to North Vietnam.

Amendment No. 52—International Wheat Agreement: Eliminates a separate appropriation for this purpose as proposed by the Senate. Wheat export payments will be financed in the future by the Commodity Credit Corporation under its commodity export authority and reimbursement will be included as a part of the annual reimbursement to the Corporation's capital funds.

Farm Credit Administration

The conferees have agreed that language on page 63 of the Senate committee report relating to retirement credit is a nullity.

National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber

Amendment No. 53—Expenses: Appropriates $475,000 instead of $350,000 as proposed by the House and $600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Provisions

Amendment No. 54—Section 501: Authorizes the replacement of 434 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 421 as proposed by the House.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
W. R. HULL, Jr.,
THOMAS G. MORRIS,
GEORGE MAHON,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
ODIN LANGEN,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege today of submitting the conference report on the bill H.R. 14596. I am pleased to say that we were able to agree with the Senate in one afternoon and the conference report I submit to you has been agreed to by all the conferees, including Congressmen WHITTEN, NATCHER, HULL, MORRIS, MAHON, MICHEL, LANGEN, and BOW on the House side, and Senators HOLLAND, RUSSELL, ELLENDER, YOUNG, and MUNDT on the Senate side.

Mr. Speaker, I have quite a bit of pride in this conference report, for it represents the action of the Congress in the true spirit of the Constitution. The Constitution, you know, provides for three divisions of the Government: the executive, the judicial, and the legislative. Insofar as those of us in the House are concerned, we are "Representatives" in the Congress. No one can appoint us. We must be elected by the people. This leaves us with the obligation of representing truly the interests of the people.

Members will recall that in the original budget submission, drastic cuts were recommended for the school lunch program, the special milk program, the watershed programs, some 94 research facilities through the country, control and eradication of various insects and diseases, including fire ant, phony peach, and peach mosaic, soybean cyst nematode, sweetpotato weevil, barberry, golden nematode, gypsy moth, witchweed, brucellosis, and scabies, research at the State experiment stations, the Extension Service, the REA, the ACP, and many other programs. The budget, in turn, recommended large increases in funds to be handled at the discretion of the Secretary.

Members of your Subcommittee on Appropriations considered these recommendations by the executive department, as we should. After consideration, we differed with the budget and put the money back where it has been through the years and where it has contributed so much toward maintaining and restoring the natural resources of our Nation, toward feeding our people, and toward making a market for our industry and labor, including making possible the highest standard of living ever known in history. As a result, the American people spend a smaller percentage for food and clothing; fewer of them have to till the soil, leaving more than 92 percent who are free to provide these other things.

Mr. Speaker, truly this is a case of the legislative body reasserting its right as it should. I am proud to submit this report to you here today.

Mr. Speaker, I have served on the Appropriations Committee for many years. In fact, only 2 Members have served on the 50-man Appropriations Committee longer than I, Chairman GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, and MIKE KIRWAN, of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, as you know it is my privilege to also serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, which provides funds for the Atomic Energy Commission, the TVA, with its water control and power program for its region, and for every river and harbor in the United States.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, with all the problems we have today, it is a great privilege to stand here and lead the fight to look after the development and protection of our resources at home, including the public health, for it is on these things that all else depends.

We have in this conference report restored and increased the following programs of the Department:

RESEARCH	
Facilities proposed for elimination or reduction—Amount restored	$4,580,200
Other increases	10,842,300
Total	15,422,500
DISEASE AND PEST CONTROL	
Programs proposed for elimination or reduction—Amount restored	7,803,100
Other increases added	2,712,800
Total	10,515,900
STATE EXPERIMENT STATIONS	
Hatch Act funds and grants for facilities—Amount restored	$10,245,000
Other increases (net)	755,000
Total	11,000,000
EXTENSION SERVICE	
Proposed budget shift of $10,000,000 from formula to nonformula distribution; not approved by Congress—Additional funds provided	3,000,000
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE	
Watershed planning: New planning starts restored to 100. Watershed protection: New construction starts restored to 80 or more. Funds restored and increased by	3,441,000
Great plains conservation funds increased by	2,388,000
CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE	
Special milk program: Funds restored to $104,000,000, of which $51,000,000 is provided by direct appropriation and $53,000,000 by transfer from sec. 32—Increase over budget of	83,000,000
School lunch program: Funds restored to $165,855,000, an increase over budget of	27,855,000
AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM	
The proposed budget cut in next year's program announcement from $220,000,000 to $100,000,000 (plus administrative costs of $30,000,000) was restored by Congress to previous level of $220,000,000—Increase over budget of	120,000,000

Reductions in less essential programs and other adjustments have made it possible to make these restorations and other essential increases and still remain below total appropriations recommended in the 1967 budget by $28,347,850. In addition, $146 million of section 32 funds will be returned to the Treasury based on conference action.

In addition, the following restorations and increases in loan authorizations have been included in this bill to meet clearly demonstrated and well justified additional needs for loan funds:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION	
Budget proposed $220,000,000 for electrification loans; bill contains total of $375,000,000, an increase of	$155,000,000
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION	
Bill increases authorization for operating loans from $300,000,000 to $350,000,000, an increase of	50,000,000

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the watershed program of this Nation is one of the finest steps we have ever taken toward leaving a rich country for our children and our children's children. I am proud that this subcommittee some years ago provided $5 million over the President's budget in order to set up 62 pilot watersheds to show the value of this program to the people of the United States.

As our domestic needs for food and fiber increase, and as our world commit-

ments grow, the budget recommends that we give less financial support to that segment of our economy which is the very basis for our personal well-being and the key to our national prosperity and international strength. The budget proposals would have seriously damaged American agriculture, which is the key segment in the Nation's partnership of agriculture, industry, and labor.

If the committee and the Congress were to have followed the recommendations of the 1967 budget for the Department of Agriculture, our whole economy would be endangered, as would our international commitments. If such a policy as the administration advocates were followed for only a few years, the United States would likely be a food deficit country instead of one of abundance.

Mr. Speaker, this committee has a long record of support for rural development. It has recognized the benefits to the Nation from programs to enable people to stay on the land instead of moving into the already overcrowded towns and cities, or to return to the land, while working in towns and cities. It has realized that, if the usual conveniences were made available in nonurban areas more and more people would be attracted to live in such areas. The committee has recognized, too, the dispersion of many activities which makes rural development essential. For many years it has supported adequate funds for rural electrification, rural telephones, housing and development loans, and loans for water, recreation, drainage and other special community facilities. It has also supported efforts to encourage industrial development to provide supplemental income in rural areas.

The committee believes, however, that such programs have been handled effectively in the past through the regular established agencies of the Department, which have been working successfully with rural people through the years. These old-line agencies have the funds, qualified technicians, and established field offices to meet the needs of rural areas. They can function more effectively if additional layers of supervision are not added between Washington and the rural areas to be served.

For example, the Farmers Home Administration has been in existence for 20 years. Its predecessor agencies, the Farm Security Administration and the Resettlement Administration go back to the mid-1930's. During this period, it has made an outstanding record of service to farmers and rural communities. It makes hundreds of millions of dollars of direct and insured loans and grants each year for nearly every phase of farm and rural community life.

Action of the Department in hiring employees under regular agencies and assigning them to the RCDS program was never approved and efforts to set up a nationwide group responsible to the Secretary in this bill has been denied. Existing farm agencies can well do the job. The conferees have agreed to continue for 1 year the force in Washington to assimilate information from the various agencies and departments of Government now engaged in this program. For this purpose, $637,000 is provided. In addition, the bill carries an extra $400,000 for the Farmers Home Administration, that it may assign State employees to coordinate and help with rural development work through its existing field offices. Also, other agencies of the Department will cooperate in the rural development program as it affects their activities.

Rural development work has meant much to my own State where to date, 182 small towns and rural areas in 64 Mississippi counties have developed special projects for central water systems, totaling more than $20 million, since a loan program financed by the Farmers Home Administration began less than 4 years ago.

We are making the fastest progress of any other State toward complete coverage of our rural areas with modern water systems so essential to better living standards and more prosperity for all.

Fifty-three new Mississippi rural water systems built since 1962 already are in operation, 38 others are under construction, and 65 more have been approved for early construction.

Modern water systems are important because they assure a constant supply of clean water in the homes of farm and rural dwellers who comprise a major segment of our working force and provide room for the people in our overcrowded towns and cities.

Mississippi's economic and social progress is getting a substantial boost through this program of FHA-insured water systems becoming available to more and more rural people in the State.

The bill as presented to you today in this conference report provides total appropriations of $6,994,590,150, which are $28,347,850 below those proposed in the 1967 budget. The following table presents the final figures for the various titles of the bill and comparisons with final conference action:

Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, 1967

Item	1966 appropriation	1967 budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1966 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I, general activities	$1,697,649,500	[1] $1,669,890,000	$1,616,876,000	[1] $1,788,840,300	$1,719,355,150	+$21,705,650	+$49,465,150	+$102,479,150	−$69,485,150
Title II, credit agencies	188,563,000	98,002,000	93,459,000	93,502,000	93,459,000	−95,104,000	−4,543,000	0	−43,000
Title III, corporations	4,493,736,000	5,254,401,000	5,165,342,000	5,181,401,000	5,181,301,000	+687,565,000	−73,100,000	+15,959,000	−100,000
Title IV, related agencies	1,500,000	645,000	350,000	600,000	475,000	−1,025,000	−170,000	+125,000	−125,000
Grand total, appropriations	6,381,448,500	7,022,938,000	6,876,027,000	7,064,343,300	6,994,590,150	+613,141,650	−28,347,850	[2] +118,563,150	−69,753,150
Loan authorization [3]	837,000,000	702,100,000	852,000,000	932,000,000	932,000,000	+95,000,000	+229,900,000	+80,000,000	0

[1] Includes supplemental request of $300,000 to Consumer and Marketing Service, consumer protective, marketing and regulatory programs for expenses pursuant to the Cotton Research and Promotion Act (Public Law 89-502).

[2] As result of conference action, an additional $146,000,000 of sec. 32 funds will be returned to the Treasury.

[3] These are loans supported by collateral and will be repaid in full with interest.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as I know, this conference agreement meets the problems of agriculture in the best way that we know how. We are pleased to be able to work this situation out to the benefit of all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly concur with the views expressed by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. WHITTEN]. As he pointed out, we were confronted with a a real problem in trying to take care of these phony budget figures which came up here for the popular on-going programs, such as research and extension service, conservation, land-grant colleges, school lunch, school milk, and REA programs. We discussed all this at some length when the bill was here on the floor of this House and I am glad to say that the Senate when they considered the measure, obviously felt pretty much the same way we did and so our conference report reflects this general feeling and accord. Obviously, there were compromises on specific figures, such as splitting the $2 million difference in the school milk program. A conference is giving and taking by both sides and while I would like to have seen the House stand pat on some of the figures, and giving in to the Senate, on others, we have come up with a fairly acceptable compromise, and I shall support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out that overall our conference report is $28,347,850 below the President's budget in direct appropriations. However, it is $229,900,000 over the President's budget in loan authorizations. This loan authorization increase comes in three main categories: $155 million in the rural electric field; $32 million in rural telephones; and $50 million in operating loans under the Farmers Home Administration. Bear in mind that these are figures over and above the loan authorization requests in the budget. It does not mean they are over that much for the 1966 appropriations. As a matter of fact, the rural electric loan authorization is $10 million over 1966. Telephone is $20 million over, and these farm operating loans are $50 million over 1966.

These figures offset by a few minor items, gives us our overall total of $229,900,000 of loan authorizations over the President's budget. The Senate figure on rural electric cooperative loans and rural telephone loans were both accepted by the majority of the conferees, but not this one.

I might point out while on this subject, Mr. Speaker, that several Members of the House have asked me whether the conferees agreed to the statements which appear at pages 47 and 48 in Senate Report No. 1370, which accompanied the agriculture appropriation bill for fiscal 1967, relating to the policy for making REA loans for power generation and transmission. It will be recalled that both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, in their reports on the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1964, set forth specific directions to be complied with by the REA Administrator before approving loans for power generation and transmission. The minor differences between these reports were resolved in a statement in the House conference report on the fiscal 1964 bill, and this was concurred in by the Senate managers at that time. During the meeting of the conferees on the pending agriculture appropriation bill, H.R. 14596, there was discussion of the statements I have referred to, which appear in Senate Report No. 1370. The managers on the part of the House did not concur in the language of the Senate report. Accordingly, the result is no action by the Congress, and the directions to the REA Administrator, as set forth in the several reports already referred to on the fiscal 1964 appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, have not been changed or modified. These directions remain in effect.

The chairman has made reference to several of the items which in the House-passed bill were to be funded by the use of section 32 funds, but which now will be funded with direct appropriations by virtue of the conference action. Frankly, I am glad to see these figures out in the open, such as the $110 million of direct appropriations for the food stamp program. I should point out that there is also $30 million reappropriated from this past fiscal year, giving us a total for the current fiscal year of $140 million.

There is a significant change in the figures for the cropland adjustment program. We agreed upon $50 million, a $40 million reduction from the House-passed bill, and this now leaves us with a figure of $100 million less than the budget request for this program.

We went along with the Senate's higher figure for restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation and this will now clean up the deficiencies of all past years with the exception of 1961, which shows a deficiency of $1,057 million. Money appropriated for this purpose, as most of you know, is in the main to make up for the losses sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation in making its sales of surplus commodities abroad for local currencies.

Mr. Speaker, during the hearings on the original House bill and here on the floor in general debate, I pointed out that the Department had a total of nearly 30,000 vehicles as of June 20, 1965, of which about 2,600 were passenger cars and nearly 300 were station wagons and buses, and that the General Accounting Office indicated that additional vehicles were not needed. While we did accept the Senate figure to replace 434 passenger motor vehicles, as against the 421 in the House bill, we can claim some credit for the disallowance of 77 new cars requested by the Department.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to update the table of U.S. Department of Agriculture employees which I had included with my remarks of last April. In summary, the Department has the staggering total of 271,164 persons on the payroll in one fashion or another:

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Employees and other personnel assisting with Department programs as of June 30, fiscal years 1956–65 and estimated 1966 and 1967

Fiscal year	USDA employees				Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service county committees						
	(Excluding Forest Service)		Forest Service		Total	Full-time county office employees	Part-time [1]			Average annual employment	Cooperative extension service [2]
	Permanent full-time	Other	Permanent full-time	Other			County office employees	County committeemen	Community committeemen		
1956	48,195	17,187	9,480	14,536	89,398	(3)	(3)	9,165	82,809	21,215	13,784
1957	51,881	17,782	10,531	15,804	95,998	(3)	(3)	9,143	79,709	26,688	14,115
1958	53,345	19,470	12,219	16,105	101,139	(3)	(3)	9,165	82,335	28,529	13,807
1959	55,013	14,033	13,359	14,815	97,220	(3)	(3)	8,862	81,555	25,569	13,500
1960	54,647	12,913	14,761	16,373	98,694	(3)	(3)	9,168	81,612	21,206	14,548
1961	57,963	11,308	13,342	19,944	102,557	14,577	(3)	9,171	80,138	22,246	13,596
1962	57,028	14,835	17,476	21,172	110,511	15,754	(3)	9,183	80,001	26,078	13,722
1963	58,644	14,819	18,863	20,612	112,488	16,194	(3)	9,195	79,995	27,297	13,858
1964	58,507	11,069	18,550	20,350	108,476	15,408	412	9,195	79,356	24,182	14,833
1965	60,331	12,438	19,666	20,582	[4] 113,017	15,339	381	9,186	77,415	23,836	15,104
1966 estimated	62,825	12,021	21,550	20,379	116,775	15,242	348	9,186	75,693	24,462	15,100
1967 estimated	63,673	11,517	22,577	20,333	118,100	15,242	348	9,186	75,693	23,923	15,100

[1] In addition to regular part-time county office employees and county and community committeemen, informal employees with no regular tour of duty are appointed for temporary periods when needed. They are on call and are paid only when they actually work. As of June 30, 1965, there were 38,920 such employees on the rolls. However, historical data are not maintained for this type of employee.

[2] Includes State directors, assistant directors, management officers, statewide and area specialists, county supervisors, county home economics and 4-H Club agents.

[3] Data on number of employees not available.

[4] Employment at June 30, 1965, was distributed among following areas of service:

Forestry (exclusive of research)	37,316
Soil and water resource protection and development	19,248
Agriculture and forestry research	12,076
Inspection and other marketing service for agricultural commodities	11,955
REA and FHA loan programs	10,338
Plant and animal disease and pest control	6,019
Price-support and other farm income stabilization programs	4,995
Crop and livestock estimates and other statistical and economic research services	3,130
Crop insurance program	1,336
Domestic food distribution	560
Foreign assistance programs	320
Other	5,724
Total	113,017

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] whether or not the net effect of the conference report is to increase potential spending over the President's budget when you include regular obligation authority and the additional loan authorization?

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

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out by my able colleague, we are above the budget submitted by the President with reference to the ceiling that is imposed each year on the authorized loans which may be made by agencies of the Department. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], a member of the subcommittee, mentioned these loans which the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers Home Administration make. Those loans are made based upon collateral. They are secured by collateral, may I say, and they are repaid, with interest.

Mr. Speaker, through the years many folk have tried to raise the question as to whether or not this is justified. It is my judgment, in view of the present inflation, the increased cost of operations in the field of agriculture, and the drive which has been going on recently which has decreased the availability of outside financing, that the committee was thoroughly justified and I believe acted wisely in lifting these loan ceilings.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat, the dollar amount of appropriations for

the regular continuing programs is approximately $28 million below the budget. The total amount that will be loaned and eventually repaid is as the gentleman from Michigan states.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and members of the subcommittee and the conferees for restoring the obligational authority which is necessary to supply adequately the funds for the school lunch program and for the school milk program and other programs where the President did make reductions when he submitted his budget to the Congress of the United States in January.

But, is it not fair to say that when you combine the obligational authority in the regular part of the bill and the loan authorization, the potential is there for more expenditures in fiscal year 1967 than what the President recommended at the time he submitted his budget?

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

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan that we are all prone to express ourselves as we see fit. However, as the gentleman from Michigan says, the bill before us will provide taking out of the Treasury more dollars for lending purposes than were provided for in the budget submitted by the President. But, as has been pointed out, those dollars will be taken out and loaned for various purposes and will be repaid. In my judgment they represent a sound investment.

The sum total in dollars that would be withdrawn from the Treasury may be more than the Bureau of the Budget recommended. But it is in a good cause and they will be repaid. Personally through the years I have never felt it proper to consider loans that a bank makes, where they will get repayment plus interest, in the same way that the operating costs of the bank are considered. They are two separate things and we have so classified them. I think our report and supporting tables which will appear as part of my statement here makes it quite clear what each of them are.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the manner in which the gentleman from Mississippi has stated the situation.

Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between obligation authority which eventually becomes an expenditure and a loan authorization because loans will eventually be repaid for the projects or the programs that are involved.

But looking at the fiscal year 1967, from the point of view of expenditure, we would have to concede that the expenditures under the conference report potentially and probably will be greater than the budget submitted by the President.

Mr. WHITTEN. I caught, of course, in the gentleman's statement the word "potentially." I will have to agree that potentially that could be true. But may I point out that this is an increase in the loan authorization. It is not really an obligation authority—although that is one way of describing it. That money is not actually withdrawn from the Treasury until the loan is made and the notes are signed and the obligation on the part of the borrower is incurred. But potentially I would have to say that the gentleman could be correct.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and also to state that I think the minority leader's analysis of this is correct.

When we compare apples with apples and oranges with oranges, I must say that this does remain beyond the President's budget. I voted against the House bill because of this very reason.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask if these figures are not correct, the total figure in the House bill was $6.876 billion; the Senate bill was $7.064 billion. This conference report before us has a figure of $6.994 billion. Am I correct in those figures?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is correct. I wish to point out again that $146 million under section 32 will be returned to the Treasury under the conference report, as compared with what would have been returned to the Treasury under the House bill.

Mr. CURTIS. But I think it is accurate to state that the House bill which was $6.8 billion has now been increased under this report to $6.994 billion. I would observe that far from doing what the President has suggested that the Congress do, of staying within the budget, we are again going out of the budget.

Mr. WHITTEN. With reference to the figures that the gentleman is quoting he should match against the increase over the House figure fact that $146 million will return to the Treasury under this conference report. So that the larger figure the gentleman quoted would have to be reduced by this $146 million to be comparable.

Mr. CURTIS. I think I was giving the net figure. In other words, if you include this $140 million, you would go well over the $7 billion. It would go well over the $7 billion and be right back at the Senate figure.

Here is the other comment I wanted to make. I think it is most important in these conference reports in these critical periods of fiscal problems in the administration, to give us these aggregate figures—the net figures so that we know what we are talking about. One cannot get this data that I was just setting forth in the RECORD on the net figures from the conference report.

I have noticed that other conference reports are singularly lacking in this kind of information. Let us not try to kid the Members here. Let us lay it out on the table. If this Congress wants to continue doing what it is obviously going to do—continue in these expenditures beyond the President's budget, let the leadership of this Congress bear the brunt of it. I certainly will not vote for it.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that today's RECORD carries the printed conference report which follows the standard form. To me it is quite plain as to what has been done. I have tried to make it plain to my colleagues.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I could not find it in the conference report, but I am informed that the Senate accepted the language of a restrictive amendment as to the funds for the Public Law 480 program in the motion of recommital by the House. As I understand it, the conference report does not adhere exactly to the language as adopted by the House in this respect. The amendment related to a prohibition of aid under the concessional sales authority in Public Law 480 to any country that trades with North Vietnam.

As I understand, the Senate version of the appropriation bill did add a clause which would permit the President to set aside this prohibition if he determined it to be in the national interest. I should like to ask the gentleman whether the House language was accepted in the conference.

Mr. WHITTEN. The conferees on the part of the House supported the gentleman's language in the first instance, and the Senate receded, accepting the House language in the conference.

Mr. FINDLEY. I should like to congratulate the conferees on holding fast on that language. To me, even though it may be somewhat symbolic, and perhaps would not affect too many countries, it certainly shows the determination of the House of Representatives to shut off aid to any country that does trade with North Vietnam.

I should like to ask the gentleman also a question about amendments Nos. 48 and 49, which have to do with Federal crop insurance. I notice that the amount authorized that can be paid from premium income for administrative and operating expenses was reduced, which came as a surprise to me. I would appreciate it if the gentleman could clarify why this change was made and why the appropriation was increased by about $100,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. As the gentleman knows, conferences are composed of two groups that have differences of viewpoint on two different bills. The gentleman is correct. The amount of premium income to be used for administrative and operating expenses is smaller than that required in the House bill, but it is larger than that required in the Senate bill. The difference between $4,100,000 and $4,150,000 is not one of the major differences between the two bodies in relation to this bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 326, nays 27, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

YEAS—326

Abbitt	de la Garza	Henderson
Abernethy	Dent	Herlong
Adair	Derwinski	Hicks
Addabbo	Devine	Holifield
Albert	Diggs	Holland
Anderson, Ill.	Dingell	Horton
Anderson, Tenn.	Dole	Howard
	Donohue	Hull
Andrews, George W.	Dorn	Hungate
	Dow	Huot
Andrews, Glenn	Dowdy	Hutchinson
	Downing	Ichord
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dulski	Irwin
	Duncan, Oreg.	Jarman
Annunzio	Duncan, Tenn.	Jennings
Arends	Dwyer	Joelson
Ashbrook	Dyal	Johnson, Calif.
Ashmore	Edmondson	Johnson, Okla.
Aspinall	Edwards, Ala.	Johnson, Pa.
Ayres	Edwards, Calif.	Jonas
Bandstra	Edwards, La.	Jones, Ala.
Barrett	Ellsworth	Jones, Mo.
Bates	Evans, Colo.	Jones, N.C.
Battin	Everett	Karsten
Beckworth	Fallon	Kastenmeier
Belcher	Farnsley	Kee
Bennett	Farnum	Keith
Berry	Fascell	King, Calif.
Betts	Feighan	King, Utah
Blatnik	Fisher	Kluczynski
Bolling	Flood	Kornegay
Bolton	Fogarty	Krebs
Bow	Foley	Kunkel
Bray	Fountain	Laird
Brooks	Fraser	Langen
Broomfield	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Brown, Calif.	Friedel	Leggett
Broyhill, N.C.	Fulton, Tenn.	Lennon
Broyhill, Va.	Fuqua	Lipscomb
Buchanan	Gallagher	Long, La.
Burke	Garmatz	Long, Md.
Burleson	Gathings	McCulloch
Burton, Calif.	Gibbons	McDade
Burton, Utah	Gilligan	McDowell
Byrne, Pa.	Gonzalez	McFall
Byrnes, Wis.	Grabowski	McGrath
Cabell	Gray	McVicker
Callan	Green, Oreg.	MacGregor
Carter	Green, Pa.	Machen
Casey	Greigg	Mackay
Cederberg	Grider	Mackie
Chamberlain	Gross	Madden
Chelf	Gubser	Mahon
Clark	Gurney	Mailliard
Clausen, Don H.	Hagen, Calif.	Marsh
	Haley	Martin, Nebr.
Clawson, Del	Hall	Mathias
Cleveland	Halpern	Matsunaga
Clevenger	Hamilton	Matthews
Colmer	Hanna	May
Cooley	Hansen, Idaho	Meeds
Corbett	Hardy	Michel
Culver	Harsha	Miller
Cunningham	Harvey, Ind.	Mills
Curtin	Harvey, Mich.	Minish
Daddario	Hawkins	Mink
Dague	Hays	Mize
Daniels	Hébert	Moeller
Davis, Wis.	Hechler	Monagan
Dawson	Helstoski	Moore
Moorhead	Reuss	Sullivan
Morgan	Rhodes, Ariz.	Talcott
Morris	Rhodes, Pa.	Taylor
Morse	Rivers, S.C.	Teague, Calif.
Morton	Roberts	Teague, Tex.
Mosher	Robison	Thompson, N.J.
Moss	Rodino	Thompson, Tex.
Murphy, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.	Thomson, Wis.
Natcher	Rogers, Tex.	Todd
Nedzi	Ronan	Trimble
Nelsen	Roncalio	Tuck
Nix	Rooney, Pa.	Tunney
O'Hara, Ill.	Rosenthal	Tupper
O'Konski	Rostenkowski	Udall
Olsen, Mont.	Roush	Ullman
Olson, Minn.	Roybal	Van Deerlin
O'Neal, Ga.	Ryan	Vanik
O'Neill, Mass.	Satterfield	Vigorito
Passman	St Germain	Vivian
Pelly	Schneebeli	Waggonner
Pepper	Schweiker	Waldie
Perkins	Secrest	Walker, N. Mex.
Philbin	Selden	Watkins
Pickle	Shipley	Watson
Pirnie	Shriver	Watts
Poage	Sickles	Weltner
Poff	Sikes	Whalley
Pool	Sisk	White, Tex.
Powell	Skubitz	Whitener
Price	Slack	Whitten
Pucinski	Smith, Iowa	Widnall
Purcell	Smith, N.Y.	Williams
Quie	Smith, Va.	Wilson, Charles H.
Quillen	Springer	
Race	Stafford	Wright
Randall	Staggers	Wyatt
Redlin	Stalbaum	Yates
Rees	Stanton	Young
Reid, Ill.	Steed	Younger
Reifel	Stephens	
Reinecke	Stubblefield	

NAYS—27

Bell	Findley	Minshall
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Fino	Ottinger
	Ford, Gerald R.	Patten
Cameron	Fulton, Pa.	Reid, N.Y.
Clancy	Goodell	Rogers, Fla.
Collier	Grover	Rumsfeld
Corman	Hosmer	Smith, Calif.
Curtis	Jacobs	Utt
Dickinson	Kupferman	Wydler
Erlenborn	McClory	

NOT VOTING—79

Adams	Giaimo	O'Hara, Mich.
Ashley	Gilbert	Patman
Baring	Griffiths	Pike
Bingham	Hagan, Ga.	Resnick
Boggs	Halleck	Rivers, Alaska
Boland	Hanley	Rooney, N.Y.
Brademas	Hansen, Iowa	Roudebush
Brock	Hansen, Wash.	St. Onge
Cahill	Hathaway	Saylor
Callaway	Karth	Scheuer
Carey	Kelly	Schisler
Celler	Keogh	Schmidhauser
Cohelan	King, N.Y.	Scott
Conable	Kirwan	Senner
Conte	Landrum	Stratton
Conyers	Love	Sweeney
Craley	McCarthy	Tenzer
Cramer	McEwen	Thomas
Davis, Ga.	McMillan	Toll
Delaney	Macdonald	Tuten
Denton	Martin, Ala.	Walker, Miss.
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	White, Idaho
Farbstein	Morrison	Willis
Flynt	Multer	Wilson, Bob
Ford, William D.	Murphy, N.Y.	Wolff
	Murray	Zablocki
Gettys	O'Brien	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Conte.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Multer with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Wolff with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mrs. Kelly.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Pike with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Craley with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Adams.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Tuten.
Mr. Stratton with Mrs. Thomas.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Denton.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Love with Mr. Boland.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COLLIER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. McCLORY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: On page 17, line 23, after "1964" strike out "$150,000,000"; and

On page 18, strike out all of lines 1 and 2 and insert "$110,000,000, and in addition $30,000,000 appropriated under this head in Public Law 89-316, approved November 2, 1965, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation:".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 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. 31: Page 24, line 25: "and in addition $1,375,000 appropriated under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the conference report and the several amendments was laid on the table.

TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3005) to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce accidents in-

volving motor vehicles and to reduce the deaths and injuries occurring in such accidents, together with House amendments thereto, and insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, FRIEDEL, MACDONALD, MOSS, DINGELL, ROGERS of Florida, SPRINGER, YOUNGER, and DEVINE.

AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13298) to amend the Organic Act of Guam in order to authorize the legislature thereof to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after "members" insert ", to be known as senators,".

Page 3, line 4, strike out "bill," and insert "Act,".

Page 3, line 8, after "provision," insert "the method of electing".

Page 3, line 10, strike out "bill." and insert "Act."

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman from Colorado would explain to the House the purport of the amendments.

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman from California will yield? As the gentleman heard, when the amendments were read, three of them are purely clerical. The other one has to do with the nomenclature used for the members of the Guam Legislature. In the Virgin Islands we have a similar body there known as the senate, and the members of the other body thought that the members of the Guam Legislature should be designated as senators also. I know of no objection to this suggestion.

Mr. HOSMER. I recall when the original bill pertaining to the Virgin Islands was before the Territories Subcommittee, I was the one who offered the amendment to change the designation of their legislators to that of senators. The basis for that was the fact that they were paid little in money and they deserved some other kind of reward, and the title seemed to fit the bill. I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATIONS OF CERTAIN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3034) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals, 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1865)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the Bill (S. 3034) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals, 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 disagreement to the amendments of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized—

"(a) to perform such additional analysis and studies as may be required on the following proposals which are pending before the Congress:

"Region 1

"Chief Joseph Dam project, Chelan division, Manson unit, along Lake Chelan in north-central Washington;

"Columbia Basin project, third powerplant, on the Columbia River at Grand Coulee Dam in Washington;

"Rogue River Basin project, Merlin division, on Jumpoff Joe Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon;

"Tualatin project, first phase, on the Tualatin River, near the city of Portland, Oregon;

"Walla Walla project, Touchet division, on the Touchet River in southeastern Washington;

"Yakima project, Kennewick division extension, near the mouth of the Yakima River in south-central Washington.

"Region 3

"Lower Colorado River Basin project, in the Lower Colorado River Basin in Arizona, California, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah.

"Region 5

"Canton project on the Canadian River below the existing Canton Reservoir in northwestern Oklahoma;

"Columbus Bend project on the Lower Colorado River Basin in Texas;

"Palmetto Bend project on the Lavaca and Navidad Rivers in Texas.

"Region 7

"Missouri River Basin project, Midstate division, on the north side of the Platte River in central Nebraska;

"Missouri River Basin project, North Loup division, on the North Loup and Loup Rivers in east-central Nebraska; and

"(b) to complete his analysis and studies and to prepare and process reports on the following proposals, which he anticipates will be completed or substantially completed on or before June 30, 1966:

"Region 1

"Challis project, Challis Creek division, on Challis Creek in southern Idaho;

"Rathdrum Prairie project, Prairie division, East Green-acres unit in Idaho, along the Idaho-Washington State line east of Spokane, Washington;

"Rogue River Basin project, Illinois Valley division, on the Illinois River, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon;

"Southwest Idaho water development project, Mountain Home division, in the Snake River Basin near the cities of Boise and Mountain Home, Idaho;

"Umpqua River project, Olalla division, on Olalla and Lookingglass Creeks in the south Umpqua Basin in southwestern Oregon;

"Upper Snake River project; upper Star Valley division, on Salt River and Cow Creek, near the town of Afton, Wyoming;

"Willamette River project, Monmouth-Dallas Division, on the west side of the Willamette River in the vicinity of Monmouth and Dallas, Oregon;

"Willamette River project, Red Prairie division, along the South Yamhill River near the town of Sheridan, Oregon;

"Yakima project, Bumping Lake enlargement, on Bumping River in the Yakima River Basin in Washington.

"Region 2

"Central Valley project, Cosumnes River division, initial phase, in and adjacent to the Cosumnes River Basin east of Sacramento, California;

"Central Valley project, Delta division, peripheral canal, in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in California;

"Central Valley project, Delta division, Kellogg unit, south of the city of Antioch, California;

"Central Valley project, east side division, initial phase, on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley from the American River on the north to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains south of the Kern River;

"Central Valley project, Sacramento River division, West Sacramento canal unit, on the west side of the Sacramento River Valley and in the Putah Creek Basin in California;

"Central Valley project, San Felipe division, in the Santa Clara and Pajaro River Basins in the central coastal area of California;

"Sespe Creek project, on the Santa Clara River and tributaries in southern California;

"Walker River project on the Walker River in west-central California and east-central Nevada.

"Region 4

"Bear River project, first phase, on the Bear River and its tributaries in north-central Utah and southeastern Idaho.

"Region 5

"Chikaskia project on the Chikaskia River in south-central Kansas and north-central Oklahoma;

"Cuero project on the Guadalupe River in south-central Texas;

"Liberty Bottoms project on the Red River below Denison Dam in south-central Oklahoma;

"San Luis Valley project, Closed Basin division, in the Rio Grande Basin in south-central Colorado.

"Region 6

"Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit (exclusive of Mitchell area), involving the diversion of water from the existing Oahe Reservoir into the James River Valley;

"Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Tower, Greenwood,

and Yankton units, on the Missouri River in southeastern South Dakota;

"Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Wagner unit on the Missouri River in the vicinity of Fort Randall Dam in southeastern South Dakota;

"Missouri River Basin project, Three-Forks division, Jefferson and Whitehall units on the Big Hole and Jefferson Rivers above Canyon Ferry Dam in southwestern Montana;

"Missouri River Basin project, Three-Forks division, West Bench unit, on the Big Hole River in southwestern Montana near the town of Dillon;

"Missouri River Basin project, White division, Pine Ridge unit, on the White River in southwestern South Dakota.

"Region 7

"Mirage Flats project on the upper Niobrara River near Hay Springs, Nebraska;

"Missouri River Basin project, Cedar Rapids division, on the Cedar and Loup Rivers near Spalding, Nebraska;

"Missouri River Basin project, lower Niobrara division, O'Neill unit, on the lower Niobrara River in north-central Nebraska,

"Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Ellis unit, on Big Creek in west-central Kansas;

"Missouri River Basin project, South Platte division, Narrows Unit, on the South Platte River near Fort Morgan, Colorado.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to continue feasibility studies on the following proposals, which are presently under study and which will require further study:

"Region 1

"Burnt River project, Dark Canyon division, on the Burnt River in west-central Oregon;

"Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Okanogan unit, on the Okanogan River in north-central Washington;

"Deschutes project, Central division, in the Deschutes and Crooked River Basins in central Oregon;

"Flathead River project, encompassing the Flathead River Basin in northwestern Montana;

"Grand Ronde project on the Grande Ronde River in northeastern Oregon;

"Rogue River Basin project, Applegate Valley division, on Applegate Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, near the city of Grants Pass, Oregon;

"Rogue River Basin project, Medford division, on the Rogue River in the vicinity of the town of Medford, Oregon;

"Southwest Idaho water development project, Garden Valley division, along the Payette River and in the general vicinity of Boise, Idaho;

"Southwest Idaho water development project, Weiser River division, in the Weiser River Basin in Idaho;

"Umatilla Basin project, encompassing the Umatilla River Basin, centering near the town of Pendleton, Oregon;

"Upper Snake River project, American Falls Dam replacement on the Snake River near the city of American Falls, Idaho;

"Upper Snake River project, Lynn Crandall division, on the Snake River below Palisades Dam in southern Idaho;

"Upper Snake River project, Salmon Falls division, south of the Snake River, near the city of Twin Falls, Idaho;

"Upper Snake River project, Snake Plains recharge division, encompassing the Snake River Plains area north of the Snake River in southern Idaho;

"Walla Walla project, Marcus Whitman and Milton-Freewater divisions, in the Walla Walla River Basin in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington;

"Willamette River project, Carlton division, on the Yamhill River in northwestern Oregon;

"Willamette River project, Molalla division, on the Molalla and Pudding Rivers in northwestern Oregon;

"Yakima project, Ahtanum unit, on Ahtanum Creek in the Yakima River Basin in Washington.

"Region 2

"Central Valley project, American River division, Placerville Ridge unit, between the South Fork American River and the North Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

"Central Valley project, American River division, Pleasant Oaks unit, between the South Fork American River and the North Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacremento, California;

"Central Valley project, Cosumnes River division, Fair Play unit, on the Middle Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

"Central Valley project, East Side division, ultimate phase, on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley from the American River on the north to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains south of the Kern River;

"Central Valley project, Pit River division, Allen Camp unit, on the Pit River northeast of Redding, California;

"Central Valley project, Stanislaus River division, Sonora-Keystone unit, on the Stanislaus River in the general vicinity of Sonora, California;

"Lompoc project on the lower Santa Ynez River in southern California;

"North Coast project, Eel River division, English Ridge unit, on the upper Eel River and in the Putah Creek and adjacent areas north of San Francisco Bay, California.

"North Coast project, Eel River division, Knights Valley unit in the Russian River Basin and adjacent areas north of San Francisco Bay, California;

"North Coast project, Eel River division, ultimate phase, in the Eel River Basin in northwestern California with facilities for the diversion of excess water into the Central Valley Basin;

"North Coast project, Lower Klamath River division, in the lower Klamath River Basin in northwestern California with facilities for the diversion of excess water into the Central Valley Basin;

"North Coast project, Lower Trinity River division (exclusive of Paskenta-Newville Reservoir), encompassing that portion of the Trinity River Basin below the existing Lewiston Dam of the Central Valley project, the upper portion of the Mad and Van Duzen Rivers and the west side tributaries of the Sacramento River in California;

"North Coast project, lower Trinity River division, Paskenta-Newville Dam and Reservoir on Stony and Thomes Creeks in the Sacramento River Basin in California;

"Ventura River project extension in the Ventura River Basin near Ventura, California;

"Washoe project, Hope Valley division, on the Carson River in California and Nevada;

"Washoe project, Newlands extension division, on the lower Carson River near the city of Fallon, Nevada.

"Region 3

"Black River-Springerville-Saint Johns project on the Black River and Little Colorado River near Springerville and Saint Johns, Arizona;

"Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, Coachella division, on the Coachella Canal in southern California;

"Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, Imperial division, on the All-American Canal and the Imperial Valley distribution system in southern California;

"Flagstaff-Williams project, near the cities of Flagstaff and Williams, Arizona;

"Kingman project, on the Colorado River and near the city of Kingman, Arizona;

"Moapa Valley pumping project in the Muddy River Basin in southern Nevada;

"San Pedro-Santa Cruz project in the San Pedro and Santa Cruz River Basins in southeastern Arizona;

"Upper Gila River project on the Gila River and its tributaries in western New Mexico and eastern Arizona.

"Region 4

"Bear River project, second phase, on the Bear River and its tributaries in north-central Utah and southeastern Idaho;

"Central Utah project, ultimate phase, Uintah unit, on the Whiterock and Uinta Rivers in northeastern Utah.

"Region 5

"Brantley project on the Pecos River upstream from Carlsbad, New Mexico;

"Cibolo project on Cibolo Creek in the San Antonio River Basin in Texas;

"Eastern New Mexico water supply project in northeastern New Mexico;

"Nueces River project on Frio River in the Nueces River Basin in the vicinity of Corpus Christi, Texas;

"Portales project near the town of Portales in eastern New Mexico;

"Rio Grande water salvage project, New Mexico division, on the Rio Grande River between the Colorado-New Mexico State line, and the existing Caballo Reservoir;

"Texas Basins project, encompassing the gulf coastal streams of Texas extending from the Sabine River on the north to the Rio Grande on the south.

"Region 6

"Missouri River Basin project, Big Horn Basin division, Shoshone extension unit, Polecat Bench area, in northwestern Wyoming near the city of Powell;

"Missouri River Basin project, Cannonball division, Mott unit, on the Cannonball River in southwestern North Dakota;

"Missouri River Basin project, Helena-Great Falls division, Fort Benton unit, on the Missouri River in north-central Montana near the town of Fort Benton;

"Missouri River Basin project, Musselshell division, Lower Musselshell unit, on the lower reaches of the Musselshell River near the town of Mosby, Montana;

"Missouri River Basin project, Powder division, Kaycee unit, on the Middle Fork and main stem of the Powder River in northeastern Wyoming;

"Missouri River Basin project, Marias division, Marias-Milk unit, in the Marias and Milk River Basins in north-central Montana;

"Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Pollock-Herreid unit, on the Missouri River in north-central South Dakota;

"Missouri River Basin project, Sun-Teton division, Sun-Teton unit, on the Sun and Teton Rivers in the vicinity of Great Falls, Montana;

"Missouri River Basin project, Yellowstone division, Billings pump unit, at the city of Billings, Montana;

"Missouri River Basin project, Yellowstone division, Cracker Box and Stipek units, along the Yellowstone River near the town of Glendive, Montana;

"Region 7

"Missouri River Basin project, Blue division, Little Blue unit, along the Little Blue River in south-central Nebraska;

"Missouri River Basin project, Blue division, Sunbeam unit, on the West Fork of the Big Blue River in southeastern Nebraska;

"Missouri River Basin project, Laramie division, Wheatland unit, on the Laramie River in southeastern Wyoming;

"Missouri River Basin project, Mount Evans division, Upper South Platte unit, on

the South Platte River near the city of Denver, Colorado;

"Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, La Prele unit, on La Prele Creek, near the town of Douglas, Wyoming.

"Alaska

"Lake Grace project on Grace Creek on Revillagigedo Island, Alaska;

"Takatz Creek project on Takatz Creek on Baranof Island near Sitka, Alaska.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to engage in feasibility studies on the following proposals:

"Region 1

"Umpqua River project, Azalea division on Cow Creek, a tributary of the Umpqua River in southwestern Oregon;

"Chehalis River project, Adna division, in the Upper Chehalis River Basin near the cities of Centralia and Chehalis, Washington;

"Upper Owyhee project, Jordan Valley division, on Jordan Creek in the Upper Owyhee River Basin in southeastern Oregon and southwestern Idaho;

"Upper Snake River project, Big Wood division, in southern Idaho in the Big Wood River Basin near the towns of Ketchum and Sun Valley;

"Upper Snake River project, Oakley Fan division, south of the Snake River near Burley, Idaho;

"Tualatin project, second phase, in the Tualatin River Basin twenty miles west of Portland, Oregon;

"Southwest Idaho Water Development project, Bruneau division in the vicinity of Bruneau in southwest Idaho;

"Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Oroville-Tonasket unit, Washington.

"Region 2

"North Coast project, Eureka division, encompassing the lower reaches of the Mad, Van Duzen, and Eel Rivers in northwestern California;

"Lake Tahoe project in the Lake Tahoe Basin in eastern California and western Nevada and the American River Basin in California.

"Region 3

"Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, East Mesa unit on the East Mesa of the Imperial Valley in southern California;

"Mojave River project in the Mojave River Basin in southern California;

"Morongo-Yucca-Upper Coachella Valley project in Riverside County, California;

"Santa Margarita project on the Santa Margarita River in southern California.

"Region 4

"Colorado River Basin, power peaking capacity, in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona, Colorado, and Utah, and in the eastern part of Bonneville Basin along the Wasatch Mountains in Utah;

"Price River project, Price River Basin in eastern Utah.

"Region 5

"Mimbres project in the Mimbres River Basin in southwestern New Mexico.

"Region 6

"Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit, Mitchell section, near the city of Mitchell, South Dakota;

"Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota pumping division, Horsehead Flats and Winona units on the east side of the Missouri River in the general vicinity of Linton, North Dakota;

"Missouri River Basin project, Lower Bighorn division, Hardin unit on the Bighorn River near Hardin, Montana;

"Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Grass Rope and Fort Thompson units on the Missouri River in the vicinity of the towns of Lower Brule and Fort Thompson, South Dakota.

"Region 7

"Missouri River Basin project, Bostwick division, Scandia unit, near the town of Belleville in north-central Kansas;

"Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, Glendo inundated water rights irrigation unit, near Glendo Reservoir in eastern Wyoming;

"Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Kanopolis unit on the Smoky Hill River below the existing Kanopolis Dam in central Kansas;

"Missouri River Basin project, Elkhorn division, Highland unit, on the Upper Elkhorn River in northeastern Nebraska;

"Missouri River Basin project, Solomon division, Glen Elder irrigation unit, on the Solomon River in the vicinity of the towns of Downs and Delphos, Kansas;

"Missouri River Basin project, Kanaska division, Nelson Buck union on Beaver Creek in northwestern Kansas.

"SEC. 4. The Secretary, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 2 and 3 of this Act, shall submit to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives within one year after completion of the final feasibility plan those studies of proposals determined to be feasible, with whatever alternate studies that may have been developed for the construction, operation, and maintenance of each water resource project or proposal in all instances where practical alternatives are known to the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide all the data and information developed on short-term and long-term benefits and costs necessary for the comprehensive and integrated development of each water resource project or proposal, including any and all factors directly, indirectly, ancillary, and/or incidental to the comprehensive development of each water resource project or proposal.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary may accelerate feasibility studies authorized by law when and to the extent that the costs of such studies shall have been advanced by non-Federal sources.

"SEC. 6. Section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes', approved June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200) is amended—

"(1) by inserting '(a)' after 'SEC. 2';

"(2) by striking out 'That' at the beginning of the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, that'; and

"(3) by inserting at the end of such section two new subsections as follows:

"'(b) It is declared to be the policy of the Congress that reclamation projects hereafter authorized in the Pacific Northwest to receive financial assistance from the Federal Columbia River power system shall receive such assistance only from the net revenues of that system as provided in this subsection, and that their construction shall be so scheduled that such assistance, together with similar assistance for previously authorized reclamation projects (including projects not now receiving such assistance for which the Congress may hereafter authorize financial assistance) will not cause increases in the rates and charges of the Bonneville Power Administration. It is further declared to be the policy of the Congress that the total assistance to all irrigation projects, both existing and future, in the Pacific Northwest shall not average more than $30,000,000 annually in any period of twenty consecutive years. Any analyses and studies authorized by the Congress for reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest shall be prepared in accordance with the provisions of this section. As used in this section, the term "net revenues" means revenues as determined from time to time which are not required for the repayment of (1) all costs allocated to power at projects in the Pacific Northwest then existing or authorized, including the cost of acquiring power by purchase or exchange, and (2) presently authorized assistance from power to irrigation at projects in the Pacific Northwest existing and authorized prior to the date of enactment of this subsection.

"'(c) On December 20, 1974, and thereafter at intervals coinciding with anniversary dates of Federal Power Commission general review of the rates and charges of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Secretary of the Interior shall recommend to the Congress any changes in the dollar limitations herein placed upon financial assistance to Pacific Northwest reclamation projects that he believes justified by changes in the cost-price levels existing on July 1, 1966, or by other relevant changes of circumstances.'"

And the House agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
CRAIG HOSMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HENRY M. JACKSON,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
FRANK CHURCH,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
GORDON ALLOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House on the conference of disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill, S. 3034, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations for certain water resource development proposals, submit this statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. All the significant differences between the language agreed upon and the language of the House amendment are explained hereafter.

BILL FORM

This legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations was submitted by the administration with the feasibility investigations divided into three categories. The investigations listed in section 1 are those which have been completed or substantially completed. Substantially all of the Bureau's on-going program for feasibility investigations is included in section 2. These investigations are in various stages of completion. The investigations listed in section 3 are recommended new feasibility investigations.

As submitted by the administration, section 3 was further broken down between those feasibility investigations scheduled for initiation in fiscal year 1967 and those scheduled for initiation after fiscal year 1967. In the Senate-passed bill, these two categories of section 3 were combined and no distinction made between investigations scheduled for initiation in fiscal year 1967 and those scheduled for initiation thereafter. The conference committee agreed upon the Senate change in form, and the conference report combines all new feasibility investigations without regard to when they are scheduled to be initiated. In connection with this action, however, the conference committee requests the Secretary of the Interior to advise both the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs which of these investigations will be initiated in fiscal year 1967 and, hereafter, to report to

such committees, prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, on the feasibility investigations to be initiated in the upcoming fiscal year, keeping the Committees fully informed with respect to any changes that are made subsequent to such reports.

FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATIONS ADDED AND DELETED

This legislation was introduced in the form recommended by the administration and, therefore, the Senate and the House considered identical bills. Both bodies added and deleted certain proposed project investigations.

In section 1, the House deleted the third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam in Washington on the basis of the committee's understanding that no additional studies would be needed, and the Mountain Park project in Oklahoma because of a water supply problem. The Senate deleted the Devils Canyon project in Alaska. The conference committee agreed to retain third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam and leave out the Mountain Park and Devils Canyon projects. Thus, as compared with the House amendment, the conference report adds the third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam and deletes the Devils Canyon project.

In section 2, the House added the Pleasant Oaks and the Allen Camp units of the Central Valley project in California and deleted the Retrop project in Oklahoma because of a water supply problem. On the basis that the feasibility studies of the Pleasant Oaks and Allen Camp units are already underway and substantially completed, the conference committee agreed to retain these investigations in the legislation. The Retrop project was left out pending resolution of the water supply problem. Thus, with respect to section 2, the conference report is identical to the House amendment.

In section 3, the House added five project investigations in Utah, the Morongo-Yucca-Upper Coachella Valley project and the Little Rock Dam and Reservoir project in California, and the Marais des Cygnes River Basin project in Kansas. The Senate added the Bruneau division of the Southwest Idaho Water Development project in Idaho, the Hardin unit of the Missouri River Basin project in Montana, and the Nelson Buck unit of the Missouri River Basin project in Kansas. Both bodies added the Oroville-Tonasket unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project in Washington, the Price River project in Utah, and the Grass Rope and Fort Thompson units of the Missouri River Basin project.

After consideration of the status of planning on the projects added by the two bodies, the conference committee agreed to retain the Morongo-Yucca-Upper Coachella Valley project, the Bruneau Division, and the Hardin and Nelson Buck units, and to take out the five Utah projects and the Marais des Cygnes River Basin project in Kansas. The status of planning on the projects left out indicates that they are not ready for the initiation of the feasibility investigations. They can be reconsidered in a year or two when the next bill to authorize feasibility investigations is before the Congress.

The projects which both bodies added, of course, were retained in the conference report.

To summarize the conference committee action on section 3, the conference report includes three project investigations not in the House amendment, and does not include seven project investigations that were in the House amendment.

PROJECT INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED THE COMMITTEES

The House amendment includes a new section 4 (not in the Senate-passed bill) which requires that the feasibility studies for those project proposals which have been determined to be feasible must be submitted to the Committees on the Interior and Insular Affairs in the Senate and the House of Representatives within 1 year after completion of the final feasibility plan. Along with the feasibility study and report on any project proposal, the Secretary must also submit the results of all studies he has made for accomplishing the project objectives in total or in part. The date of completion of the final feasibility plan for a project is considered to be the date when the Secretary approves the feasibility report.

The studies and information on the project proposal and on the alternatives are expected to supply sufficient information for the committees in the Congress to make intelligent and informed decisions with respect to the project plan to be authorized. In respect to both the project proposal and the alternatives, the Secretary must furnish to the committees all the detailed information developed during the studies.

The conference committee agreed to retain this section in the legislation but adopted minor language changes to make it clear that the language of this section is not intended to require the Secretary or the Bureau of Reclamation to study project alternatives in more detail than is required under present policies and procedures. In other words, the language of this section is not intended to be the basis for increasing the cost of project investigations. On the other hand, the language is intended to require the Secretary of the Interior to furnish the committees all of the information which is developed in connection with project investigations, including information on all of the alternatives studied, in order that the committees and the Congress may judge whether, considering all relevant factors, the best plan of development has been recommended.

FEASIBILITY STUDIES WITH DONATED FUNDS

Section 5 of the House amendment was a provision authorizing the Secretary to conduct feasibility studies on any project proposals when and to the extent that the costs of such studies are advanced by non-Federal sources. The purpose of this provision was to encourage financial participation by States and local interests in these investigations. The language in the Senate-passed bill (sec. 4) permitted feasibility studies to be accelerated with funds advanced by non-Federal sources, but provided that such studies could not be initiated without specific congressional authorization. The conference committee, agreeing that all feasibility investigations should be specifically authorized, even though conducted with donated funds, adopted the Senate language.

AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND COULEE DAM ACT

The Senate-passed bill included a new section (not in the House amendment) which amended the authorizing act of the third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam (sec. 6 of the conference report). That act establishes a form of basin account for the Pacific Northwest and provides for financial assistance from the Federal Columbia River power system to reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest that are hereafter authorized.

The purpose of the proposed amendment to the Grand Coulee Dam Act is to specify the conditions under which such financial assistance may be given and to place a limitation upon the amount of such assistance. The language of a new subsection 2(b) provides that reclamation projects hereafter authorized in the Pacific Northwest must be scheduled in such a manner that the required financial assistance for those projects, together with financial assistance for previously authorized projects, will not cause increases in the power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration. With respect to the limitation on the total amount of assistance to irrigation for both existing and new projects, such amount cannot exceed an average of $30 million annually in any period of 20 consecutive years. The financial assistance must come from "net revenues" as defined in the language of this new subsection.

The language of a new subsection 2(c) provides for a periodic review by the Secretary of the Interior of the adequacy of the amount authorized for irrigation assistance and recommendation by the Secretary to the Congress for any changes that may be needed in the limitation on irrigation assistance.

The conference committee has made certain editorial changes in the language of the new subsection 2(b) of the amendment to the Grand Coulee Dam Act as included in the Senate-passed bill, and it also has revised the second sentence of that new subsection to read:

"It is further declared to be the policy of the Congress that the total assistance to all irrigation projects, both existing and future, in the Pacific Northwest shall not average more than $30,000,000 annually in any period of twenty consecutive years."

The remainder of the second sentence has been stricken as unnecessary since it states the expected results of procedures presently followed. It is not the conference committee's intention to change the Federal Columbia River power system repayment policies and procedures adopted by the Secretary of the Interior in April 1963 and set forth in the hearings on H.R. 7406 before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, September 9 and 10, 1965.

Nothing in this new subsection 2(b) is intended to expand or to limit present Bonneville Power Administration authority to purchase or exchange power.

The conference committee approved, without change, the language of the new subsection 2(c) of the proposed amendment to the Grand Coulee Dam Act.

The amendment to the Grand Coulee Dam Act set out in section 6 of the conference report is not concurred in by Mr. SAYLOR and his signature on the conference report and on this statement of the House conferees indicates his approval only of the remainder of the legislation.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
CRAIG HOSMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which we bring back to the House today is on legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations under reclamation law on specifically identified potential water resource development projects. For all practical purposes, this legislation covers the entire feasibility investigations program of the Bureau of Reclamation. It is necessary because of a provision which the Congress placed in the Federal Water Project Recreation Act which was enacted last year. That provision requires that hereafter all feasibility studies conducted under reclamation law must be specifically authorized. Heretofore, the Secretary has had general authority to investigate and report on reclamation projects.

As passed by the House on July 18, 1966, this legislation included authority to complete feasibility studies on 144 projects of which 31 investigations would be new planning starts. With respect to the ongoing investigations program, the

conference committee added one investigation not in the House-passed bill and deleted one project investigation that was in the House-passed bill. With respect to the new planning starts, the conference committee included three project investigations not in the House-passed bill and deleted seven project investigations that were in the House-passed bill. These actions by the conference committee were based upon careful examination of the status of planning on the affected projects.

The conference committee retained the House-approved provision which provides a time limit on the submission to Congress of feasibility reports after completion and requires the Secretary to furnish the legislative committees all of the information which is developed in connection with project investigations, including information on all of the alternatives studied, in order that the committees and the Congress may judge whether, considering all relevant factors, the best plan of development has been recommended.

The House-passed bill would have permitted feasibility studies on projects when the funds for such studies were advanced by non-Federal sources. The conference committee agreed upon the language in the Senate-passed bill which permits feasibility studies to be accelerated with donated funds, but such studies cannot be initiated without specific congressional authorization.

There was one new provision in the Senate-passed bill which was not in the bill considered by the House. This is a provision which amends the authorizing act of the third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam. This provision was accepted by the conference committee with certain language changes.

The Grand Coulee Dam Act establishes a form of basin account for the Pacific Northwest and provides for financial assistance from the Federal Columbia River power system to reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest that are hereafter authorized. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to specify the conditions under which such financial assistance may be given and to place a limitation upon the amount. As adopted by the conference committee, the language provides that the financial assistance for reclamation projects, both existing, and future, will not cause increases in power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration, and it limits the amount of such assistance to an average of $30 million annually in any period of 20 consecutive years. The conference committee determined that this amount would be adequate to meet the foreseeable needs for such assistance in the Northwest. The new language includes provisions for a periodic review of the adequacy of this amount authorized for irrigation assistance and for recommendation by the Secretary of any changes that may be needed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report on S. 3034.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the language of the conference report is perhaps better written than that which was discarded. I concur with the gentleman's approval of the conference report.

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

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 935 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 935

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. 15963) to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Speaker, those who listened to the reading of the rule will know that it provides for an open rule, that it waives points of order, and provides 4 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15963, a bill to establish a Department of Transportation.

I suppose that all Members know that there has been some controversy over the bill itself, the Department of Transportation bill, but nobody has sought time from me on this side, so I will assume that there is little controversy on the rule, and reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding.

I am sure he knows I want to ask my usual question: Why is there a waiver of points of order? Was it asked for by the chairman, or did the committee in its wisdom put it in?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I will reply to the gentleman from Missouri by saying that it was requested by the gentleman from California, the manager handling the bill. This consolidates in one Department a number of other agencies and functions which are transferred to the Department. Naturally, the funds are too. So for all practical purposes there are a number of reappropriations in the bill. The only way they can be protected would be by having a waiver of points of order. I believe the Committee on Rules agreed with that unanimously. That is the reason the rule so provides.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, putting it into a nutshell, it makes germane appropriation changes within an authorization bill submitted by a legislative committee.

Mr. BOLLING. It makes in order those appropriations.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, House Resolution 935 does make in order consideration of H.R. 15963, the Department of Transportation bill, with 4 hours of debate under an open rule, except that points of order are waived. It does provide for transfer of funds, and it is necessary to waive points of order for that reason.

The purpose of the bill is to establish a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation, bringing together a number of Federal agencies and activities involving transportation promotion and safety, but not the economic regulation, which will remain with the appropriate regulatory agencies currently performing that job.

It is estimated that the new Department will employ 100,000 people and spend some $6 billion in Federal funds presently expended annually on transportation.

There is no need to dwell on the tremendous population growth and movement which has occurred in the past 20 years, and will explode even more dramatically in the next 20 years. A few figures will suffice to state the case: by 1975 about 120 million vehicles may be on American roads; domestic airline traffic may double by 1975; by 1975 intercity ton-miles of cargo and intercity passenger miles may reach 2,440 billion and 1,464 billion respectively, increases of 65 percent over current figures. It is clear that our transportation system will be greatly taxed to provide demanded service, demands which must be met.

A number of agencies, and some functions of other agencies will be transferred to the new Department. Chief among these are: First, the office of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, along with its staff and programs; second, the Bureau of Public Roads and the Federal highway program it administers; third, the Federal Aviation Agency, with its functions in safety, development, and subsidy programs; fourth, the Coast Guard with its activities relating to transportation and marine safety; fifth, the Maritime Administration with its construction and operating subsidy programs; sixth, the functions of the CAB to determine probable causes of aircraft accidents and its appellate functions related to safety certificates and licenses are transferred to

the National Transportation Safety Board created by the bill. The CAB's function in accident investigation are transferred to the Secretary of the Department of Transportation and will be delegated to the Office of Accident Investigation, also created by the bill; seventh, the safety functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, primarily the inspection and enforcement of safety regulations for railroads, motor carriers and pipelines.

In addition to the transfer of these agency functions to the proposed Department, other chief features of the bill include:

First, the exclusion of the transportation resources of the DOD from the new Department. Nor will the administration of the Panama Canal come into the Department—it will remain with the Army.

Second, there is created a National Transportation Safety Board within the Department. Its purpose is to determine and report the cause or probable cause of transportation accidents, and to review on appeal the orders of the Secretary in amending, suspending, or revoking any certificate or license issued by the Secretary. It is authorized to conduct studies relating to safety. The Board will be comprised of five members, appointed by the President with Senate confirmation. It will have its own budget and staff, but be within the Department.

Third, an Office of Accident Investigation is created in the Department to investigate aircraft accidents, independent of the FAA—transferred into the new Department—and using the former CAB investigative personnel.

The Secretary of Transportation is given the authority to set standards and criteria to be used in determining where Federal funds will be invested in transportation facilities or equipment. Currently this authority is diffused among several agencies, each concerned with a particular area in which it has expertise. The Water Resources Council's area of authority is exempted from this section; all others are included. The bill provides that the Secretary cannot promulgate standards or criteria contrary to existing law.

A number of additional views are presented. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] supports the bill but wants a stronger attack on transportation noise, particularly with respect to aircraft.

Members DWYER, REID of New York, HORTON, RUMSFELD, ERLENBORN, and WYDLER support the bill. They point to facts and projections indicating current and rising problems, and believe that Federal coordination is indicated. They do feel that in several areas the proposed Department is not adequate to its projected role, particularly in removing economic regulation from its authority. Mass transportation is also left out. They point out that for all the talk of an independent safety board, it is not so in fact; its appropriations will be controlled by the Department, and it has no authority to conduct its own accident investigations. It independently will only determine probable cause. These Members also believe that air accident investigations should remain with CAB, or be transferred to the Safety Board rather than to the Office of Accident Investigation to maintain fuller independence from other aircraft controls transferred into the Department.

Finally, these Members question section 7 of the bill which provides for the Secretary of Transportation to set standards and criteria for the investment of Federal funds on transportation facilities and equipment.

Members CALLAWAY and DOLE oppose the bill as reported, though they believe the concept to be sound. They cite the present lack of coordination among the present modes of transportation, but they believe the Department will not solve the problems, because authority is fractured, some taken into the Department, some not.

They do not believe that the problems of our merchant marine will be solved by moving the Maritime Administration from Commerce to Transportation; what is needed is for the executive to see the problem and follow the urging of Congress to request appropriations.

They point to the current success of the aviation industry under its present CAB, FAA control and see no reason to change, pointing to the problems of the railroads operating under ICC control.

They believe that safety and accident investigation and prevention, particularly with respect to airlines will suffer under the bill as independence is lost, and one Department will, in effect, be investigating its own safety regulations. They note that the National Transportation Safety Board does not even have authority to conduct investigations, but merely determining probable cause; it is the Secretary who is actually charged with responsibility to conduct the investigations.

They strongly oppose section 7, on much the same basis as do other members, that is, too vague a grant of power to the Secretary, with the clear possibility that he may, by the use of Federal funds, indirectly set Government policy in transportation.

Members BROWN and DICKINSON oppose the bill on these four points: First, section 7 abrogates congressional control of Federal investment in the fields of transportation; second, most modes of transportation have prospered without Federal coordination; third, urban mass transport is not even included in the bill; fourth, the independence of accident investigation is destroyed with the bill which will provide that the Department investigate itself—a very unlikely situation. They do believe a bill could be prepared to remove these problems and be a positive good for the industry.

Mr. EDWARDS, recently appointed to the committee, and a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, confines his views to the merchant marine problems. He points to our falling tonnage, our old ships, and our growing needs. Merely moving the agency to a new department is not the solution. Money for ships, which the administration has continually refused, is the answer.

I believe our big problem today, as I understand it, will be on the merchant marine situation. There may be other amendments offered, but at the time the Committee on Rules heard this particular bill, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was considering a bill related to this. They have had this problem for a long period of time, as to the future of the merchant marine. Many of the members who testified, from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, stated that in their opinions the Maritime Administration has been more or less a stepchild within the Department of Commerce for many years, and that we are far behind on needed ships, possibly 100 ships or more. They requested that we try to hold up a rule on this bill until they could finish their hearings, and possibly make their bill, as they reported it, the one in order.

That did not seem to be what we could do at that time, because there was not any bill before us, so a rule was granted.

Subsequent thereto, a rule also was granted on H.R. 11696, which will remove the Maritime Administration from this particular bill and set it up as a separate agency. That will present some problems here today, Mr. Speaker.

As I understand it, the proponents of that position—which I personally support—will make a motion or offer an amendment to strike that part from this bill which deals with the Maritime Administration, so that subsequently that can be considered in a separate bill. I know that those who are completely in support of this bill will not agree with me, but some feel if it is not done at this particular time we may never get an opportunity to do it later on.

I want to bring that to the attention of the House, because this is where the tough vote is going to come today.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman anticipate that with the passage of this bill there would be an abolishment of existing agencies of one kind and another, or would they still exist?

Mr. SMITH of California. The agencies which are in existence, as I understand it, going right down the line—the Bureau of Public Roads, the highway program, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Coast Guard, the Maritime Administration, and so forth—all would be transferred into this new Department of Transportation, at the Secretary level.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, that is just the trouble. I went through the business of establishing the Defense Department. We were told by any number of Members of the House at that time—some of whom are still here—of the economy which would be obtained through the creation of the Defense Department. None of the various departments which existed previously was abolished. All were simply brought in, lock, stock and barrel, and on top was a layer of "fat" created, known as the Department of Defense.

We were supposed to have common catalog purchasing and free exchange of information, but nothing happened. Today we do not have a common purchasing catalog worthy of the name in the Department of Defense. Recently—only a few weeks ago, I believe—they needed certain calibers of ammunition in Vietnam. Instead of picking up the telephone and calling the other departments that use ammunition, such as the Navy and the Marine Corps, no one bothered to do that, but instead they went out and ordered it, when there was surplus to the use of the Marine Corps millions of dollars worth of this ammunition. It is incredible that a situation like that can exist in the Department of Defense, but we got nothing except an added layer of fat in the Department of Defense plus a huge payroll. If this is what we are out to do here, I want no part of it.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I will say in reply to the gentleman that I really do not see the connection between what I read in the report and the testimony here. I do not think we are trying to do away with any of these departments.

Mr. GROSS. Why not do away with them if you are putting it all in one Department?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am trying to answer the gentleman's question as long as he brought it in on this particular bill, if he will just let me do so.

The report shows that there is a tremendous population growth and that this growth will continue. Probably in the next 20 years we may have a tremendously larger number of people and vehicles. The report and the testimony show that the argument is in order to handle this large growth we should have a Department of Transportation with a Secretary who can run it. I see nothing there about doing away with any agencies or any savings, and I do not think there will be any savings.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that there should be abolished some of the agencies presently existing? If an argument for the creation of this brandnew Department of the Government is to provide for more efficiency, with less overlapping and so on and so forth, then why should not some of these agencies presently existing be abolished?

Mr. SMITH of California. I cannot answer the gentleman.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. There is a subtlety involved in this particular piece of legislation in that the responsibilities, duties, and powers of the FAA and the Bureau of Public Roads and a portion of the Interstate Commerce Commission are transferred, but those agencies as such are not going to be moved to the new Department of Transportation intact. The Secretary of the Department of Transportation under this legislation is given complete power to reorganize those agencies as he sees fit, so that the Bureau of Public Roads and the FAA will only be recognizable if the Secretary of the Department of Transportation wants them to be recognizable.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I have no further requests for time and know of no objection to the rule.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. 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. 15963) to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

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. 15963, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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 California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself to 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15963 would establish a new Department of Transportation, making the 12th Department of Cabinet rank in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, it would bring together major Federal agencies and programs relating to transportation, promotion and safety, but not economic regulation which remains with the regulatory bodies.

Mr. Chairman, as the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union know, President Johnson sent his transportation message to the Congress on March 2, 1966, strongly recommending the creation of a Department of Transportation. His message highlighted the urgent contemporary problems which exist in the transportation field and emphasized the pressing need for a solution.

Mr. Chairman, in the year 1842 the great English poet, Tennyson, in his poem "Locksley Hall" said:

For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the World, and all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue.

Mr. Chairman, that was in 1842. This is the year 1966. This present-day generation is called upon to look into the future.

Mr. Chairman, we have pending before us today a bill that seeks to set up an organization, a Government organization, which will take care of the problems of transportation in the future.

Mr. Chairman, we have in this country 195 million people. It is estimated by Government students on population trends and growth that by the year 2000 we will have 362 million people. We will have to double our transportation facilities; yes, possibly treble them, because as we live in a more affluent society, there will be a constantly increasing trend of population and, therefore, the utilization of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to move the goods, the manufactured goods, the food, the products of the field and factory from place to place within the United States and throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, our transportation system has grown up helter-skelter, without any plan for coordination, without any plan as to efficiency of operation.

Mr. Chairman, some of our transportation modes have become obsolete, others have forged ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to analyze this bill which is pending before us today. I have placed in the RECORD of August 22, 1966, which is under the seats of the Members, an analysis of the bill. That analysis begins on page 20129. Therefore, I am not going to drone on for 25 or 30 minutes upon the analysis of this bill.

The 4 hours of debate in my opinion will give us an adequate time to consider the different sections of the bill.

I want you to know that this new Department will rank fifth among the 12 Cabinet-level Departments in Federal funding—fifth. It will rank fourth in employment used by transportation services, 14 percent of the Nation's work force.

So we are talking about a not unimportant Department, but we are talking about the fourth and fifth among our most important Departments in our 12 Departments of Government when this is established.

We are talking in terms of gross national product of about 14 percent of our gross national product of 700-some-odd billion dollars. That is what we are talking about.

We are following out the principle of the Hoover Commission. I was a member of the second Hoover Commission and I handled some 50-odd reorganization bills as chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization during those years.

We are talking about in this instance the bringing together in one new Cabinet-level Department the major scattered instruments of transportation located throughout the Government.

If you will look at the chart to my right, you will see the modes of transportation on the bottom line.

We are setting up a Federal Railroad Administration.

We are setting up a Federal Highway Administration.

Those are the two basic transportation modes at the present time in terms of tonnage and people.

We are transferring over into this Department a Federal Maritime Administration which has gone through a

number of changes. In 1950 I handled the Reorganization Plan No. 21. It has had another Reorganization Plan No. 7 in 1961. It has been an independent agency. It is now in the Department of Commerce. It is in a subordinate position in the Department of Commerce because the Department of Commerce is concerned with many subjects, many fields of jurisdictional duty and implementation. But in this Department there will only be one objective, there will only be one subject matter. That subject matter will be the one problem, the great problem of transportation.

So in moving the Maritime Administration from its present subordinate position in a department with many unrelated subject matters, we are upgrading it by putting in a department with only one interest, the interest of transportation. We are putting it on the same level as aviation. The same level as railroads. The same level as highway administration.

To those Members who have had a chance to read my remarks, they will find reference to subsidies. I think if they will read the latter part of my remarks they will find that I said that since World War II the Federal Government has funded to the tune of about $3 billion maritime transportation. But they will also find that I refer to other subsidies to other transportation modes far greater than the maritime subsidies.

I say that he who wants to point the finger of charging subsidies to the Maritime Administration should look also to the subsidies we have given to the railroads in free right-of-ways in the early days, in giving them every other section of land—land containing in many instances mines, coal fields, and oil fields. We have given the railroads attractive tariff rates through our regulatory bodies.

I would not know how to compute the hundreds of millions and possibly billions of dollars that we have used to subsidize the railroads.

Let us get to the Federal highway system. We have a program now which this Congress is supporting of approximately $50 billion over the period of the next 10 years to finance the highways for the benefit of the private automobile owners and for the benefit of the huge commercial trucking industry.

Let us consider, then, that in the present program of highway financing we have about a $50 billion cost tag.

Let us move to aviation——

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. I hope I misunderstood the gentleman when he said that we were subsidizing the highway construction industry.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will complete that thought for the gentleman. Of course, we have taxes that pay back into the fund. We have taxes that pay back into all the different modes of transportation. But in the obligation of Federal funds at low-interest rates for these programs there is an element of subsidy. Now, I am not fighting the subsidies.

Mr. FALLON. There is no subsidy in the highway construction program. There is no borrowing of money. We have the use taxes to build these highways; so the people who use them are paying for them now and even highways that have not yet been built. They are already paid for. But there is no subsidy on the part of the Federal Government because the people are paying their way in this field.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman wants to say that the taxes that the people are paying in for these highways is not a public subsidy, that is all right with me. I will not argue the point.

Mr. FALLON. A public subsidy but not a Federal subsidy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am talking about subsidies. The same thing is true of your airplane tickets. You pay a tax on the airplane tickets you buy, and that goes back into the operation of the FAA. The expenses of that Agency are running about $750 million a year and about $200 million is being paid back in the form of taxes raised in various ways. But with Federal funds we are building airways and airports, and we are operating with about 40,000 people the aviation facilities in our towers, our weather bureaus, and other facilities that contribute directly to that industry.

So I am not using the term "subsidy" to run down the Maritime Administration. I want that to be made very clear. I am trying to put it in perspective because some people say that we should not have a Maritime Administration, and I do not say that, as anyone can see in my remarks. I say that we should have.

Now, there will be a move made to strike out the Maritime Administration from this bill, I am told. No one can foresee the future. If this occurs, I want the Members of this House to think about it very seriously. Will they obtain a dynamic, viable maritime program by withdrawing themselves from the mainstream of transportation attention, and getting off to one side and playing solitaire in the backroom, or if they allow themselves to be put into this Department of Transportation—and that is where the chips are—they might be able to sit in and get a few more chips from that game.

This is a matter of judgment for the House. I am not going to complain with anyone as to how they vote on this issue. I am not going to bleed on this subject. If after considering the arguments that will be put forth the majority of the Members want to vote to strike it out, that is within their power, and as the servant of the House, of course, I will abide by the result.

Needless to say, I will oppose the effort because I honestly and sincerely believe that the time has come when we need research and development in every form of transportation—yes, paid for with Government funds. I am not against that, because it is for the benefit of the people of this Nation to move their bodies and to move their goods. But I am going to ask the Members of this House to consider whether they believe they will get more attention with a Secretary of Cabinet-level rank to plead their case before the various committees of Congress and the President or would they get more attention with a low-level administrator of a relatively small independent agency.

That is the problem we have to face. I know the pressures we have been under. I have had a little of it myself. I have some big ports in California handling about 75 million tons out of those ports. I believe Los Angeles ranks maybe third or fourth within the Nation. It is within 8 miles of the edge of my district. But we stand in the light of history. We have to make the decision as to what is best for this Nation in terms of the overwhelming problems that we are going to face tomorrow.

In the July Fortune magazine, there is a great and interesting article on transportation, with a picture of a modern train. The article states that we can have right now, with the technology we have, 125-mile-an-hour trains. It tells a lot of things. It tells how we can move, on a highway that costs $6 million a mile, 7,500 people an hour, and how we can move on a high-speed train 45,000 people per hour.

It tells a lot of things—things that need to be done, things that the Secretary of this Department is charged with considering under the purpose of the bill, which is to develop an overall national policy of transportation. Get the declaration of purpose of the bill and read it.

It is up to the Secretary to do research and develop an improved, safe, efficient national policy and to come to the Congress with recommendations.

Here I want to make a final, and I believe important, point. When H.R. 13200 was brought up to our Committee on Government Operations I looked at the bill, which was sent up by the administration, and I said "This bill is not a good bill. It cannot be passed in the House of Representatives, and it should not be passed as it is." My committee worked hard. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN], and others on his staff and on my staff worked hard. We rewrote the bill, and we bring it for consideration of the Members as a rewritten, clean bill.

What were the principles we worked under? We worked under these principles. We proposed to transfer over into this department the four modes of transportation, but we are going to respect the statutory responsibilities and duties which have already been enacted by the Congress.

We are going to respect the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. We are not going to allow in this bill changes in statutory duties and responsibilities which they have enacted in that committee.

We did the same thing on Public Works. We said that the new Department Secretary cannot touch the highway fund. If anyone wants to touch the highway fund, the Secretary will have to go before the gentleman from Maryland's [Mr. FALLON] committee, and tell him why he wants to touch it. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] and his committee can then work on that problem, and they can approve it

or disapprove it, and refer whatever they want to do to the Congress, because it has to be done from a statutory standpoint.

We did the same thing in the merchant marine field. We said that we cannot change the functions which pertain to the Merchant Marine Committee without going to the Merchant Marine Committee.

We did this with the Post Office and Civil Service. My staff conferred with the staff of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and we worked out a number of places where the bill would have changed laws pertaining to the classification and hiring of personnel.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] will offer a final amendment. We have made changes at his suggestion, and the suggestion of his staff, and we worked out even as late as today a final amendment which will make sure that the dual compensation law, which is a prerogative of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, will be followed in this bill.

So we have said in this bill that we are not going to encroach upon the powers of the President, and we are not going to let the President encroach upon the powers of the Congress. We are going to keep it as it is, and if they want to change the statutory responsibilities which have been enacted over the years, let them go to the respective committees and get them changed.

Could anything be more fair than that?

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

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from California, the manager of this bill, not only upon the statement he is making but also upon the long, long weeks of painful, arduous, and careful study he has devoted to this problem. There has been careful, painful, arduous study devoted by the committee, and specifically by the manager of the bill, to a detailed analysis and study of each one of the functions proposed to be encompassed in this new Department.

I am convinced that to the extent it has been humanly possible for the legislative mind and craftsmanship so to devise the gentleman from California, through his leadership, and his committee which met and studied this with him, have carefully preserved the integrity of each of the functions, so that no function benefits at the expense of another and so that no function of transportation is unduly harmed.

I believe he has preserved a balance of powers which had existed in the statutes between the executive and legislative branches. I know he has been extremely careful to preserve the integrity of the Congress. He has given to the administration no power it did not already possess, and has taken from the administration no power it possessed. He has taken from no committee any right or jurisdiction it possessed, and he has given to no other committee a right or power that would act to the detriment of any other committee of the House. Above all, he has preserved inviolate the integrity of the Congress and its right to review in the same manner it has reviewed in the past each of these various programs.

I should like for the House to realize the long, hard, careful hours of detailed study and analysis that went into the preservation of this careful and delicate balance which the gentleman from California has brought to us today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. The gentleman knows that we worked with the gentleman from Texas, with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], and the staff of the Public Works Committee to very carefully take everything out of the original bill that interfered in any way with his committee. Our committee has worked hard and done a good job. It is up to the Membership of the House whether we are to move forward into the future or to look back toward the past.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Last week we passed two bills having to do with auto safety. It is my understanding that this new Department will have jurisdiction over traffic safety in its general sense; is that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It would be my thought that when the Highway Administration is set up, all existing statutes on that point—and I believe the bills were drawn with at least the knowledge in mind that this legislation was in process—would go into this, and all these elements of safety on our automotive transportation system would be placed in this Department.

That would be at the lower level, at the operating everyday level. It would probably be in the same hands it is now in.

In the field of the National Transportation Safety Board, which is a planning and recommending field, they would look at highway, railroad, aviation, and shipping problems with the idea in mind of suggesting improvements but not implementing them. They would have to come to the Congress if they wished to do anything other than the statutes on those subjects which we have already enacted provided.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I appreciate that. In respect to the two bills we passed last week, one established within the Department of Commerce a safety advisory board or commission. I do not have the correct wording in front of me, but it is a committee to advise the Secretary. The other bill, which came from the Committee on Public Works, established a similar type of board, only to be appointed by the President subject to the advice and consent of the Senate.

These are two conflicting committees or boards, in my opinion. Would this legislation perhaps draw those together, so that there would not be a conflict of the two boards?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would think it would. Of course, we cannot in legislating for the future try to correct, and I tried not to correct, statutory provisions whether they were in harmony or in conflict. This would be part of the job of the Secretary of Transportation, that is, he should come before the proper committees and first work out a solution if there is a conflict and then come before the jurisdictional legislative committees for such changes as might be necessary that he might need over and above the existing statutory provisions given to him by simple transfer.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is undeniable that it is a historic occasion when we consider the creation of a new executive-level department. As has been pointed out by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], this would be the 12th such executive Cabinet Department, if this bill is successful and the Department of Transportation is created. It is also interesting to note that several of the existing Departments were created in this century, one of them just last year, in this particular 89th Congress. Last year when we considered the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development I took the floor to oppose that bill. Presently in our subcommittee we are considering the creation of a Department of Consumers, and I oppose that bill. However, I take the floor today in support of the creation of the Department of Transportation. Now, there has to be some reason to take this divergent view in opposing the creation of two Departments and supporting the creation of a third. I think it is important that we know we must have some pragmatic test against which to test the proposal to create a new Cabinet-level department. I think that test should be, Is there a sufficient body of Federal law, and is there a sufficient amount of Federal activity in this field to warrant the organizational structure to be developed for this particular activity? Now, the Department of HUD, as we pointed out last year, did nothing but take the Housing and Home Finance Agency and raise this to Cabinet level. It did not, as the sponsors so often said, bring together diverse activities of the Federal Government and put them under one roof so that we would have a better administration of our Federal laws. The same is true of the proposed Department of Consumers. It does not bring diverse Federal activities together and put them under one roof for proper administrative purposes. Here in this proposal, though, to create a Department of Transportation, we do meet the test of bringing together diverse Federal activities in the field of transportation, and we put them together in one Cabinet-level Department so that we can have the proper administration of these interrelated and presently fragmented Federal activities relating to the transportation industry. Just as one example of the fact that there is a sufficient level of Federal activity in this field is the fact that the proposed Department would have immediately, just from the agencies now existing which it would bring into the Department, 100,000 employees and

an annual budget in the various activities of some $6 billion. I think this alone is ample evidence of the fact that there are sufficient Federal activities and Federal programs in the field of transportation so that they should be coordinated.

Now, some of the background as to the importance of transportation itself. At the present time some 20 percent of our gross national product each year consists of outlays for transportation services. At the present time we have a population of some 200 million people, and by the end of this century it is anticipated that population may be doubled, which will increase at least twofold the demands for the movement of goods and people.

Mr. Chairman, in 1946 there were 1.5 million miles of paved roads in this country. Today there are 3.25 million miles of paved roads and we have not as yet satisfied the demand.

Mr. Chairman, over the past century we have seen the evolution of the railroad industry from a transportation monopoly which needed to be closely regulated so that the public interest could be protected. It is a business that is in great difficulty because it is in keen competition with other modes of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, in this century we have seen the invention of the airplane, we have seen the instigation of air travel, we have seen the progress through a Federal subsidy, to the point where now no major air carrier is any longer in need of subsidy, but in fact they are very healthy and in some cases wealthy enterprises.

So, Mr. Chairman, there has been a tremendous increase in the demand for transportation, a tremendous increase in Federal involvement in the field of transportation in the last 50 or 60 years.

A Department of Transportation was first proposed in the late 1800's. Today, I believe, we have reached the time in history when the creation of a Department of Transportation, if it is not overdue, is certainly due.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at a few of these things which have brought this picture into focus and which have caused a proliferation of agencies and commissions that have been created and which have attempted to put the imprint of the Federal Government upon the field of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, we have the Civil Aeronautics Board, we have the Federal Aviation Administration, we have the Interstate Commerce Commission, we have the Bureau of Public Roads, we have the Maritime Administration and the Maritime Commission, we have the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. This is just to name a few.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this particular bill will not bring together all Federal activities in the field of transportation. I do not want anyone to be misled into thinking that this is a cure-all; and probably it is not.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the interest of the Federal Government in transportation we find that it has a twofold aspect. First of all is economic regulation and this function is served by independent commissions primarily such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and like commissions; the Federal Maritime Commission, for instance, and designedly, these commissions were created as independent commissions and not as a part of the role or normal operation of the executive branch of our Government, because they exercise economic regulation, they exercise a quasi-legislative, a quasi-judicial function.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government's activity having to do with planning, research, promotion, safety regulations, and noneconomic regulations, is within the normal operations of the executive branch of the Government, agencies, and Cabinet-level departments. A part of this is lodged in the Department of Commerce and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, we do not propose in this bill to affect the economic regulatory functions of the independent commissions, and I do not believe we should ever do so. I do not believe we should give to any administration, whether it be Democrat or Republican, the power to set, through the executive branch of our Government, the policy for economic regulation. Therefore, properly, the Interstate Commerce Commission in its economic regulatory functions is left out of the bill, the Federal Maritime Commission is left out of the bill, and the regulatory functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board are left out of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings on this bill were extensive and lasted over a period of several months.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] for his patience in hearing all of these witnesses and in scheduling the hearings day after day. Many pages of hearings were filled with the testimony of the people who would be affected, the people representing the various modes of transportation who would be affected by the creation of this bill.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for those remarks and I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Illinois who is one of the hardest working Congressmen I have worked with. We have worked together in the committee. In many instances we came to agreement. He made many valuable suggestions. There were a few areas in which we did not agree but we did not disagree disagreeably, as the gentleman will tell you.

I want to pay tribute to the gentleman and his colleagues on his side, but particularly the gentleman who was there every minute of the hearings and worked just as hard as any of the Members of this House.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of the hearings, I discovered—and the other members of the committee discovered that generally speaking the representatives of industry and labor alike in the field of transportation did support the concept of the creation of a Department of Transportation.

I think the original testimony developed from the representatives of the various modes of transportation—the airlines, the highway truckers and the railroad industry, had a rather similar ring to it. That was that they did like the concept of a Department of Transportation, but—and then usually they would have some exceptions that would almost in effect have taken them out of the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I think the action of the subcommittee in amending the bill in providing for separate administrations to represent the modal interests, satisfied most of the demands of industry for amendments to the bill to see that their interests were separately represented by the Maritime Administration, the Highway Administration, the Aviation Administraton and so on.

One of the sections which came under the most criticism was section 7. Some amendment was made to section 7. Some of those who opposed section 7 were appeased when exceptions were added to this section to make the particular activities they were interested in exempted from the Secretary's control to establish standards and criteria, so some people were satisfied with those amendments.

The committee also improved the bill by beefing up the powers of the National Transportation Safety Board.

In the administration bill when first introduced, this was nothing more than a hollow shell. So these improvements were made. But I do not want to leave the impression with anyone that I think the bill is as yet perfect. Although I support the bill, I think there are some serious defects.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have had correspondence with a number of people, because of my interest in aviation in regard to the desirability of leaving the Federal Aviation Agency out of the so-called Department of Transportation.

I wonder if the gentleman could advise the Committee, and myself in particular, as to the reasons for the action in rejecting this request. I understand the request was made that the Federal Aviation Agency remain as an independent Agency but it was included for reasons that you apparently have decided to be in the best interests of anyone.

I wonder if the gentleman could elaborate on this for the purpose of the RECORD?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I would be happy to.

Mr. Chairman, in the field of Federal activity in the aviation industry, it may be somewhat unique in that we have two separate agencies—the FAA and the CAB, both of them quasi-independent agencies, presidentially appointed and confirmed by the Senate.

The FAA has as its principal function the regulation of air traffic, the opera-

tion of air traffic controls. The CAB has as its principal function the economic regulation of the air transportation industry.

The rationale in putting the FAA into this Department is that in these noneconomic regulatory functions, such as the promotion of the industry and the conduct and control of the airways, this properly belonged in the executive branch of the Government in this new Department.

But the economic regulatory functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board did not belong in a new Department but should remain an independent Board such as the ICC is for the railway industry.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. You do not feel that their function will be diminished by, as someone has described it, being swallowed up in this overall Department and therefore will not be able to be responsive to the changing needs in the aviation fields?

Mr. ERLENBORN. No, I do not think they will. I think they are properly in this new Department, which will have an overall view of transportation.

I should mention one other thing. Though we are not transferring the CAB into this Department, we are taking the safety function of the CAB, the accident-investigating function. We are placing it in the new Department. This is one of the defects in the bill. Only a few short years ago this Congress, in its wisdom, separated the accident-investigating function and put it in the CAB and made it separate from the function of the FAA in conducting traffic in the airways, so that we now have the CAB as an independent body, including the investigating activities of the FAA.

This bill as it now stands would merge these two functions and would put us back to where we were 10 years ago, and we would have the anomaly of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation having the accident-investigating function and, on the other hand, having the FAA activity, so that in effect he would be investigating himself. This is one of the amendments I hope will be adopted to separate out this function. I will offer such an amendment.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. I think it should be made clear that only the functions, duties, and responsibilities of the FAA are transferred to the Department of Transportation, but FAA is not transferred not as an organizational entity into the new Department. In other words, the Secretary of the Department of Transportation would have the opportunity to set up any kind of organization he wants under the new Federal Aviation Administration.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Then you are satisfied that the function of the FAA will not be jeopardized in any way?

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. I am satisfied that the function of the FAA will be moved into the new Department. I am not satisfied that it will not be jeopardized.

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

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

Mr. McCLORY. I commend the gentleman for his expert exposition of this legislation. I also wish to congratulate the gentleman from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Illinois on producing this important legislation. I happen to come, as does the gentleman in the well, from a metropolitan area, northeastern Illinois. I am particularly interested in the subject of urban mass transportation. I would like to inquire as to whether or not this subject is included within this legislation, and whether the function of promoting and improving urban mass transportation is going to come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I am happy the gentleman asked that question because it brings me to the closing part of my remarks. This is again one of the defects that is presently in the bill under consideration, even though, as I have said, the subcommittee did a fine job in other areas of the bill. But to answer the question specifically, the urban mass transportation program, which was established by legislation last year and placed in the Housing and Urban Development Department because at that time there was no Department of Transportation, under this bill would stay in the Housing and Urban Development Department.

If we have a real transportation crisis in America, it is in the cities and urban areas of the United States. If we are going to coordinate our transportation activities, and if this new Department of Transportation is to be meaningful whatsoever, we should have the urban mass transportation program under the Secretary of Transportation, and at the proper time I will offer an amendment for that purpose.

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

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

Mr. McCLORY. I am interested in the gentleman's comments and also in the subject of his proposed amendment because it does seem to me that the subject of our highways and the subject of urban mass transportation are so closely interrelated that they really belong in the same Department. I feel very strongly that the encouragement of urban mass transportation is the only answer to relieving our highways leading into our great metropolitan areas and within our metropolitan areas, and it would certainly be appropriate, in my opinion, to employ funds for highway purposes or to provide funds for the general purpose of providing highways and for relieving highways through the promotion of Department of Urban Mass Transportation facilities.

I am not suggesting that this is the full function of the Federal Government. But I do feel the Department of Transportation is an appropriate Department of the Federal Government in which these functions should be carried out and directed, so that the metropolitan area itself can provide the maximum of highway facilities as well as urban transportation facilities for the large populations that reside in those areas.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I agree with him wholeheartedly.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

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

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, we are presently and we have been appropriating moneys for research in transportation and also high-speed ground transportation within the Department of Commerce. Is it true that this new agency of transportation would assume this responsibility, or would it remain within the Department of Commerce?

Mr. ERLENBORN. It will remain in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as I recall. I am not certain. Certainly the urban mass transportation stays in Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. SLACK. Perhaps the gentleman did not understand me. I was talking about transportation research.

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman is talking about the northeast corridor high-speed?

Mr. SLACK. No, the transportation research. Since 1962 we have appropriated $7,625,000 in the area of transportation research. In addition to that we have appropriated $18,250,000 for the high-speed ground transportation. These are both within the Department of Commerce at the present time. My question is: Would they be transferred to the new Department of Transportation?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Yes. I understand the gentleman's question. My understanding is that they will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me say, as I understand it, the functions of the Department of Commerce relating to transportation are transferred to the new Department of Transportation.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to reaffirm what the gentleman has said, that the functions of transportation that are now in the Department of Commerce are transferred over into the Department of Transportation, in line with trying to put all transportation matters together.

The gentleman has correctly said we have not put urban mass transit in, and there will be some discussion of that matter. We have not put in the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and the Alaska Railroad. There are a few things that have been left out, but reasons will be given, both pro and con, on that later.

Mr. SLACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ERLENBORN. In summation, there are defects in this bill, as I have stated. Let me point out what these are. In colloquy they have been developed to a certain extent.

The fact that the accident investigating function of the CAB is going to be merged in with the Secretary of FAA is a defect, in my opinion, and also in the opinion of people in the industry it is a defect. This function should be separated out. Accident investigation should not be undertaken by the Secretary, so that he will not be investigating himself.

Section 7, although it has been amended, is still very unacceptable. Section 7 gives the Secretary of the Department the right to establish standards and criteria.

There is an amendment in this bill offered by the majority, which was adopted, that would give the appearance of making this unobjectionable, because it says—and this is in section 4(e)—that the standards and criteria so established by the Secretary shall not conflict with standards and criteria established by the law. The fact is, there are few if any standards or criteria in the area of Federal investment in transportation. There are few if any legislative enactments relating to standards and criteria in the Federal transportation area.

This still gives the Secretary pretty much of a free hand to establish standards and criteria for transportation. It also would require that any other agency or department proposing an investment in transportation by the Federal Government would have to establish their plan according to the facts developed by the Secretary of Transportation, and conform their proposal to the standards and criteria established by the Secretary of Transportation.

It appears to me that in the original bill as introduced by the administration there was an attempt to take what is now the function of Congress and give this to the executive department.

Actually, this whole area is somewhat a gray area, part executive, part legislative, but there certainly was an attempt by the administration to swing the pendulum over to the executive and to give all the power to the executive department in establishing standards and criteria for water resource projects and all other transportation projects.

If this section remains in the bill, that pendulum will still be on the side of the executive, taking congressional prerogatives and giving them to the executive department.

At the proper time I shall offer a motion to strike section 7 from this bill. I do not believe we can improve this section. I do not believe the amendments adopted by the subcommittee and the committee have made much of an improvement to this section. I believe that the entire section 7 should be stricken from the bill. It has no real bearing on the other powers and functions of the Secretary of Transportation.

So the amendments will be offered at the proper time. I hope I will have the support of the membership in improving the bill even beyond the point the subcommittee and the committee did in their deliberations.

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to pay some tribute to the chairman of the committee and to the senior Republican and other members who worked with them on the Committee on Government Operations for doing what I believe is a splendid job in full accord with the highest traditions of this legislative body in protecting the statutes as they now exist, as passed by the Congress, and at the same time putting them into an agency where they can be administered fairly and constructively.

Mr. Chairman, throughout history, the degree of development of a national transportation system has been a determining factor in boosting or in limiting the heights of greatness to which nations have aspired. Today our network of roadways, railways, waterways and airways monitor the heartbeat of our Nation—restraining us when inadequate, beckoning to us when lying useless.

The United States can be proud of its vast and varied system of mobility. In no industry has the inventive genius of the American people been more pronounced. No nation in history has been so successful in drawing together the far-flung reaches of its geography into a cohesive unit, working together to create the standard of living we enjoy.

We are no longer in a period of infancy in the development of our transportation system. We are in a period of highly sophisticated and challenging growth. In this era of development of supersonic transports, giant aircraft, high-speed rail transportation, and interstate highways, we cannot ignore the need for unified effort in planning and constructing a well-balanced transportation system that will complement and aid the growth of our country in all respects. We cannot permit even the possibility of an antiquated, uncoordinated, wasteful transportation system that would stifle the progress of our country.

Today we are considering legislation to establish a department in the Government that will provide the framework within which a coordinated effort can be put forth. In the past, as a particular type of transportation has become an important influence in our economic structure, the Government has assumed its responsibility for encouraging, assisting, protecting, coordinating and sometimes regulating the industry so that it could best serve the needs of our country. Water transportation was undoubtedly the most prominent means of linking the colonies along the Atlantic seaboard together. Rail transportation conquered our western frontiers in the late 19th century. The automobile and the highway virtually revolutionized the way of life in every community in the country in the early 20th century. Now, air travel pulls us even closer together.

Presently we have a fragmentation of Government agencies dealing with the administration of the Government's interest in transportation matters. The ICC watches over the railroads and motor carriers while the Federal Maritime Administration and the Coast Guard are responsible for water transportation and the FAA and the CAB share responsibilities in aviation. The Department of Commerce has various functions in the field of transportation, particularly with regard to automotive travel. Transportation safety is scattered all over the Federal Government.

This fragmentation is not conducive to the development of a well-rounded, coordinated system. It lends itself to duplication and waste and leaves large areas untouched. Our Government cannot deal haphazardly with an activity of such national importance. Every dollar must be invested wisely if we are to maintain a transportation system which complements and aids the other segments of our economy.

We can afford neither an overexpansion nor an underexpansion in any individual mode of transportation. The problem now is with mixing and balancing the various means of travel in proper proportion so that for any given need, we will have the most efficient and convenient method of travel available. Only with sufficient direction, coordination, and cooperation can we delineate the problems and achieve the optimum reward for the investments of both the Government and the private citizens of this country.

The Government invests billions of dollars each year in highway construction, aircraft research and development, air traffic control, ship construction, railroad inspections and other transportation activities. Certainly there should be an officer of Cabinet rank to oversee the various programs and policies which we here in Congress have enacted.

In the new Department, these programs will be continued, but will be carried on in an environment oriented toward a complete transportation system rather than one distinct and isolated segment of the system. The advantage of a coordinated effort is obvious when we recognize the interrelation of the several modes of transportation—airline passengers travel to and from the terminals over superhighways; freight is delivered to and taken from the wharves by rail. There is no logic in administering these interdependent segments of the transportation system in separate Goverment agencies. A departmental organization with cognizance over all administrative transportation functions will permit a comprehensive evaluation of our needs and problems and enable us to develop an overall policy to meet the demands of the future.

Our cities and industrial complexes continue to grow at fantastic rates. The demands upon our rural areas for agricultural products and natural resources to support them will grow at a similar rate. This expected growth will impose a crushing burden on our existing transportation facilities. No one has suggested that our transportation system will not expand, but the Government's participation and investment in this ex-

pansion will be most productive only if made in a systematic, coordinated, and well-planned manner. No new department has faced a greater challenge nor held more promise. We cannot risk failing to recognize and meet that challenge.

Mr. Chairman, the state of our transportation may determine the state of our Nation. I urge the enactment of this vital legislation that will create a department through which this Government can fulfill the need of the people of this country.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15963. I think it is a good bill but there are some features, particularly the one I am going to address myself to, that warrant special attention.

Let me say first I want to join with my colleagues in acknowledging the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] rendered monumental service to the House in bringing this bill to the floor today. We know that he and the members of the staff, together with minority members, worked countless hours, days, nights, weeks, and months in order to bring to the floor a very difficult and involved but at the same time a very useful bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks specifically to an amendment that I propose to offer at the appropriate time to create within this Department an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement. Something must be done now to help to alleviate what has become, in my judgment, a most acute social problem in the areas surrounding our cities. Many Members of Congress have been particularly disturbed, as have their constituents been, about the problem of aircraft noise. The gentlemen from New York [Messrs. ADDABBO, TENZER, and WYDLER] and I have all spent many months, if not years, trying to see if something could not be done to alleviate if not to eliminate this very, very difficult social problem. Those of us who live near cities I am sure are aware of the interesting comment that the New York Times editorial offered on August 17, 1966, in commenting on the airline strike when they said the following:

> About the only blessing of the airline strike is that life has been a bit quieter for the people unlucky enough to live within roaring distance of jet airports. Now that the planes are about to fly again it is time for Congress to do something about taking the decibels out of the aerial parade.

There is an enormous amount of evidence which documents the extent of the aircraft noise problem.

Aircraft noise is a matter that affects probably some 10 or 20 million American citizens, and I think it is about time that Congress did something to meet its responsibility in this very difficult area.

A brief review of what we have not done in the past might be useful in deciding what we ought to do in the future. All of you know that the jet engine was developed by the Air Force essentially for military purposes, and those that developed the jet engine were concerned with thrust and speed and not with noise. Airport neighbors in those days were told that they had to learn to live with this problem and had to accommodate themselves to it in the interest of national defense. The fact is that the aircraft industry itself has done virtually nothing about solving the problem of aircraft noise. As I said in my separate views, which I commend to all of you, appearing on page 76 of the committee report:

> Efforts over the past years have been far less concerted than many of us in Congress have thought necessary and believed possible. Airplane manufacturers have not been falling over each other in competition to produce quieter aircraft. Noise abatement research and development, after all, hardly promises higher profits. Indeed, it can be said that noise abatement has been to the airline industry what safety engineering has been to the automobile industry. It has been, in short, an irritating and costly sacrifice which private industry is understandably reluctant to undertake.

At the present time the Department of Commerce, the FAA, and the NASA have all made some efforts, but only token efforts. And this problem is of such proportion that is will not yield to tokenism. Everybody knows this is true.

Essentially, Mr. Chairman, past efforts, in principal, have only been in the areas of flight pattern planning. Budgets have been incredibly low. For example, in 1966 NASA requested nothing for research and development in the field of aircraft noise abatement, and whatever little money that Congress forced upon them, they refused to spend.

Mr. Chairman, several months ago, for the first time, after prodding by Members of Congress, the FAA established a noise abatement service. This same group also serves as the interagency committee, made up of the Assistant Secretary of HUD, Commerce, and NASA. There are four people—only four people—assigned by the FAA, to supervise the alleviation of aircraft noise abatement.

Mr. Chairman, this entire problem, I believe, is important to 10 to 20 million people, a problem which has created more controversy in the affected areas surrounding our cities than any other, and it is going to have to be solved by only four people. They are outstanding public servants—these four—but they have neither the influence nor resources to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is that up to now no one has really felt the need to do anything. The FAA has obviously been subject to pressure from the aircraft industry. There has been no effective spokesmen for the airport neighbor. My proposed office would provide that voice.

Mr. Chairman, the President acted in April of this year for the first time in recognizing that this is a problem. He established a Presidential panel on jet aircraft noise. Subsequently, he established an interagency group consisting of representatives of HUD, Commerce, OST, FAA, and NASA. We all welcomed that interagency group. But I submit that such an agency is not the most likely to be active day in and day out. It is under no obligation to meet or to report to Congress. It has no continuing guarantee of funds. And, in any case its staff is the same four men who work on the FAA noise abatement staff. I repeat, their resources and influence are insufficient.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 239]

Adams	Gettys	Roudebush
Andrews, Glenn	Hagan, Ga.	Schisler
Ashley	Halleck	Schmidhauser
Baring	Hanna	Scott
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Senner
Broomfield	Hébert	Sickles
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Mo.	Sikes
Cahill	King, N.Y.	Smith, Calif.
Callaway	Kirwan	Sweeney
Carey	Kluczynski	Thomas
Celler	Landrum	Toll
Cohelan	Long, La.	Tupper
Conable	McEwen	Tuten
Conyers	McMillan	Walker, Miss.
Cooley	Martin, Ala.	White, Idaho
Cramer	Martin, Mass.	White, Tex.
Denton	Morrison	Williams
Diggs	Multer	Wilson, Charles H.
Ellsworth	Murray	Wolff
Evins, Tenn.	O'Brien	Zablocki
Flynt	Powell	
Fogarty	Resnick	
Foley	Reuss	
Ford, William D.	Rivers, Alaska	
	Rogers, Tex.	
	Rooney, N.Y.	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, 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. 15963, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 358 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 New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] had 4 minutes remaining. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, the present effort on the part of the Executive to meet this acute problem is dissipated and proliferated among a number of agencies. As I mentioned before, this kind of dissipation is simply inadequate to our needs. It was for this reason that the administration set up the FAA noise abatement service. They already realize the problem, in other words. My view is simply that their new concern and recognition will not receive sufficient expression without a visible office by virtue of congressional mandate

Mr. Chairman, in 1966 the FAA, which has primary responsibility in the rerearch and development field of noise abatement, received $780,000; in 1967, it is proposed to receive only $565,000. Nobody believes this is enough. But the noise abatement cause requires more political muscle if it is to get the money it

needs. And this is where my proposed Office fits in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

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

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time, first, to compliment the gentleman in the well for taking up the fight for jet noise control and abatement. I will support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and I should like to indicate my support of H.R. 15963, a bill to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] which will provide for the establishment of an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement within the Department of Transportation, will only take care of one aspect of the problem of jet noise. I want to alert my colleagues, my constituents, as well as the millions of citizens who reside in and around the Nation's airfields that this is only a very small step we are asking the Congress to take today by the adoption of the proposed amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the creation of an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement merely sets up an office to coordinate our efforts to reduce aircraft noise. We may very well by this means avoid the duplication of effort which has up to now taken place in attempts to find a solution to the problem.

Mr. Chairman, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, I called to the attention of my colleagues that a number of agencies of our Government are engaged in one form or another of noise research. By combining all these efforts we may be able to avoid a waste of funds. The establishment of a noise abatement agency connected with the new Department of Transportation does not provide a mandate from Congress to accelerate the efforts in this field. This is what is needed and this is what I will continue to urge. It does not give to the Department of Transportation the additional regulatory powers which it needs or the funds required to make real and substantial progress in combating jet noises.

Mr. Chairman, I live in the shadow of Kennedy airfield, and various flight paths travel over my own home and over the homes of many thousands of my neighbors in the Fifth Congressional District of New York.

Millions of people living in and near our airports are similarly affected.

I urge my colleagues to review the statements which I have made in this Chamber on the subject of aircraft noise abatement, and I refer to my previous remarks:

	Page
May 6, 1965: "Aircraft Noise Abatement"	9701
Daily RECORD, May 13, 1965: "Jet Noise—Opens the Floodgates of Litigation"	A2377
Daily RECORD, May 20, 1965: "More on Jet Noise: NASA Conference"	A2533
Daily RECORD, May 27, 1965: "More on Jet Noise—Part IV—NASA Research Program"	A2718
Daily RECORD, June 10, 1965: "More on Jet Noise—Part V—FAA Aircraft Noise Symposium"	A3037
Daily RECORD, July 8, 1965: "Jet Noise—Part VI—Hazard to the Nation's Health"	A3630
Aug. 12, 1965: "More on Jet Noise—Part VII—Report on Noise Forum"	20398
Aug. 30, 1965: "More on Jet Noise—Part VIII—Novel Test Over Long Island and Correspondence With the President"	22277–22278
Sept. 15, 1965: "The Latest on Jet Noise—Part IX"	24020–24021
Mar. 2, 1966: "President Recognizes Jet Noise Problem"	4810–4811
Mar. 21, 1966: "President Johnson Acts on Congressman TENZER's Jet Noise Plea"	6420–6421
May 3, 1966: "Debate on NASA Appropriation"	9679–9685
July 12, 1966: "Jet Noise: A Plea for Bipartisan Support"	15392–15393
Daily RECORD, Aug. 8, 1966: "Jet Noise" (delay the supersonic transport)	A4263

Mr. Chairman, I call to the attention of the gentleman in the well and to my colleagues that the additional steps needed will be the subject of hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to which my bills—H.R. 7982 and H.R. 16172, have been referred. The Committee will also consider the bill introduced by Chairman STAGGERS of that committee.

These bills when reported to the floor will present a more comprehensive and more meaningful program for effective noise abatement control.

I make this point, so that my support of the proposed amendment, may not be misunderstood. I want to indicate to my colleagues that this is not a cure-all or an answer to all of the problem of jet noise.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his efforts and welcome his support when I continue to fight beyond the action to be taken by the House on his amendment. I know I can count on his support in the long-range fight to find a solution to a national menace.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] for his thoughtful approach to this serious problem and for having focused the attention of the Committee upon the question of aircraft noise control and abatement.

When the NASA authorization bill was on the floor on May 3, I urged that $20 million additional be utilized by NASA to conduct a full-scale research program on the engineering problems inherent in jet noise. I pointed out that NASA was the proper agency to deal with the engineering questions associated with aircraft noise control and abatement. Unfortunately, the amendment which I supported was rejected, as was the motion to recommit with instructions similar to the amendment. In other words, the House voted to postpone the day of reckoning.

Five or six agencies have been involved in this problem without overall coordination or a sense of urgency. It is time that this matter receive the priority it deserves, for the effects of jet noise are becoming more serious every day for those who live in the shadow of our great airports and the noise belt of our airplanes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I think the bill before us expresses the theory of unifying command and responsibility in the field of transportation. This is good administration. I believe it is also good administration to assign specific statutory responsibility for a problem everyone knows is crucial. Only then do we assure action and provide for the continual review of a concerned Congress.

The very fact that this chart sits here today is an indictment of the failure to respond to this need.

Nowhere on this chart, under the responsibilities and duties listed for the Federal Aviation Agency is there one sentence or any comment of any kind about executive responsibility in the field of aircraft noise abatement. If the executives of the Department of Transportation are disposed to take this as a serious problem, then surely there must be some agency, some bureau, some other office responsible for getting at this problem. It is for this reason that this amendment is offered today.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for his initiative in this regard and to his statements, and I wish to lend my support to his amendment.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman alluded to the chart. There are many sections that are not portrayed on the chart. The use of the chart here is as an organizational chart.

But the gentleman is well aware that we wrote into the bill in section 4, page 5, lines 4 to 6, that the Secretary should promote and undertake research and development in relation to transportation including noise abatement with particular attention to aircraft noise. So we have given them a charge, a responsibility, and a duty. Many of these duties are not on the chart. The reference to the chart is inconsequential, in my opinion.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am very much aware of the amendment we added into the bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further——

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Because of the gentleman's interest—and it has been very great and he has been a great help to the committee—and the interest of others on the committee, we did write in that particular section of the bill a serious charge and responsibility to the Secretary to get to this matter. As the gentleman knows, there are other bills, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] has just mentioned, which go to the substantive problems, and which are in the jurisdiction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I acknowledge that, and I acknowledge publicly my gratitude to the gentleman from California for inserting that provision in the bill. But the simple difference between the gentleman from California and myself is that I am convinced that the provision he refers to requires a specific office for its effective implementation. This would be a statement by Congress that we expect something to be done, and that we want to see a single agency responsible for action. It is a direct responsibility which Congress will be assigning to the proposed Secretary. I think this carries more significance and muscle than a mere commentary in the foreword of the bill. Once the office is established, it will have access to the Bureau of the Budget, it will have access to the Secretary, and it will know the American people have spoken through the Congress and expect something to be done.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 15963, which would establish a Department of Transportation on a Cabinet level. As a Representative from a metropolitan area surrounding New York City, it is clear to me that we must increase our efforts to combat the choking strangulation with which we are faced on our highways, railroads, and airways. In the jet era we cannot get by with horse and buggy policies.

I am impressed by the statement of the Committee on Government Operations that in 1965, 87 million vehicles traveled the streets and highways of the Nation, and that it is estimated that in another 10 years the number of such vehicles will double.

No matter how diligent existing agencies may be, it is necessary to combine them under one head to make sure that their efforts are coordinated and integrated. I think it important that such agencies as the Federal Aviation Agency, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission be subject to common control and direction. I believe that a most important function of the Department of Transportation will be to conduct research and development aimed not only at improving the flow of transportation facilities, but also combating the air pollution and the noise which plague our cities.

I hope that this legislation will be enacted by an overwhelming majority.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I support the Rosenthal amendment to establish within the Department of Transportation an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement. I commend the gentleman from New York for offering this amendment.

If we are to find a solution to the problem of aircraft noise, then the responsibility for all noise abatement efforts and functions must be coordinated and concentrated within one office in the new Department. At the present time they are spread about among several Federal agencies—the FAA, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Several weeks ago I introduced a bill to provide for aircraft noise abatement study and regulation. Other Members have offered similar proposals, and the administration is strongly in favor of such legislation. This is a serious problem to which we must find an answer. I have received many complaints from residents of my 22d District in the Bronx, N.Y. The Bronx is severely affected as well as the Queens area in Long Island—since the addition of long runways at La Guardia Airport. But it is not a problem only in my city; it is one which confronts the residents of cities throughout the country which are adjacent to airports.

The office which would be created by the amendment offered by my colleague from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] would be the logical agency and would provide the sensible approach to coordinating and carrying out the objectives of my bill, and similar bills, to study, control and regulate aircraft noise.

I strongly support the gentleman's amendment and I hope the Committee will adopt it when we come to the amendatory stage of consideration of this legislation to create a Department of Transportation. I urge my colleagues in the House to join me at that time in supporting the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] to establish an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO].

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] as a member of this Committee on Government Operations, for bringing again to the attention of this House through this bill the serious question of aircraft noise abatement which besets us in Queens with reference to the Kennedy-La Guardia Airports, but which will also affect many more areas with the additional airport activities and the increase in the jet noise of additional jet aircraft as is attested to by the increased concern of more and more of our colleagues each year.

Mr. Chairman, I generally support the bill before us, H.R. 15963. There is a need to bring the various agencies involved in the various modes of transportation together where the overall problems can be dealt with. The importance of these functions cannot be minimized for our national well-being depends upon an efficient and healthy transportation industry.

I was disappointed that the bill, as reported, does not give sufficient recognition to the most troublesome area of air transportation, I refer to the problem of aircraft noise for which I and my Queens and Nassau colleagues have for many years sought a solution. Greater recognition of this problem must be given—the problem has to be conquered. The amendment to be ofered relative to the establishment of an Office of Aircraft Noise Abatement by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], should be adopted.

There is another area in the bill before us which I am convinced is a mistake. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the maritime affairs should not be included in the Department of Transportation. The problems and importance of the maritime industry are of such importance that they can be dealt with effectively only through a separate and independent Federal Maritime Administration. I shall support the amendment which will be offered to strike maritime matters from this bill.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office, Committee on Appropriations, I have had firsthand dealings and knowledge of the work of the U.S. Coast Guard, now an arm of the Treasury Department. The Coast Guard was originally established to prevent smuggling and like activities—today it still has important work and functions in this area and, of course, has been enlarged and given many other duties. However, by no stretch of the imagination, can one justify including this agency in a Department of Transportation. If it is believed that the Coast Guard no longer belongs in the Treasury Department, then the only logical move would be to move it into the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we can have a good bill and a more effective Department of Transportation with the adoption of the amendments I have discussed. The need for the new Department is apparent—let us make it the best possible.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for the amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL]. This amendment deserves support, in my opinion, because it would provide the kind of office that is so urgently

needed to administer the aircraft noise abatement regulations proposed in another bill, H.R. 15875, also sponsored by the gentleman from New York.

Every Member of this House was, I am sure, relieved and happy last Friday when the 6-week-long airline strike ended. By Saturday morning, however, those who live near airports were reminded of the relative silence during the strike. Today's high-speed jet transportation is a mixed blessing. With all its conveniences, it has brought the inconvenience—and sometimes discomfort of noisy skies.

Yet, as Mr. ROSENTHAL pointed out so well in his supplementary comments to the committee report on H.R. 15963, activities by existing agencies to curb aircraft noise "have been so modest because they have lacked any specific and vigorous statutory instruction. They have been so limited because no office has been specifically designated by the Congress to study and prosecute noise abatement policy. The conditions requiring an effective Federal aircraft noise abatement program, in other words, are exactly similar to those arguing for a strong transportation safety policy. The effort must be centralized, coordinated, designated by statute, and instructed to direct all its energies to that single purpose."

In another section of his comments, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], said that—

Noise abatement had been to the airline industry what safety engineering has been to the automobile industry. It has been, in short, an irritating and costly sacrifice which private industry is understandably reluctant to undertake.

Mr. Speaker, the President's Special Panel on Jet Aircraft Noise, which issued its report last March, concluded:

Initiative for solving problems of jet aircraft noise can effectively come only from a source not compromised by economic interests in conflict with those of the major groups now involved—engine and aircraft manufacturers, airline operators, and local governments. And there is only one source meeting this constraint which can be functionally effective—the Federal Government.

The problem of aircraft noise, while concentrated mostly around airports in metropolitan areas, is nevertheless a national problem. Without question, it is going to get worse before it gets better. One of the areas now concerned with the problem is Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., site of a major international airport. In July the operators of the airport, the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission, passed a resolution recognizing the need for Federal action. One pertinent part of the resolution says:

The Congress should act as quickly as practicable upon the recommendation of the President or, in the alternative, on its own initiative confer upon the Federal Aviation Agency or other body or group, in its wisdom, the authority to establish and promulgate a maximum standard of aircraft noise in perceived noise decibels or other acknowledged standard and to vest the authority and power in the Federal Aviation Agency or other appropriate body, to enforce adherence to such standards by all aircraft operators, or take such other action as will result in effective discipline over the total problem.

Mr. Chairman, I think an "appropriate body" in which to vest the much-needed authority to promulgate aircraft noise abatement standards would be the office proposed by this amendment. I urge the support of all Members of the House. In so urging, I ask that the resolution passed by the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission be printed in its entirety:

RESOLUTION No. 661

Whereas the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission, operators of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport—Wold-Chamberlain Field, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, has a vital interest in urging a solution to the aircraft noise problem; and

Whereas the noise created by the present jet aircraft is becoming a more serious problem and a solution of this problem is daily becoming more urgent; and

Whereas the problem defies solution at the local governmental level and is properly a problem of national concern by virtue of Federal Statutes defining the airspace to be within the public domain and subject only to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government; and

Whereas an orderly approach to the problem requires an extensive evaluation of the consequent effects created thereby, an analysis of the means by which aircraft noise annoyance can be reduced to acceptable levels, and the formulation and adoption of a comprehensive integrated program to solve the problem in the interest of the public; and

Whereas the President of the United States, in his message on Transportation delivered to the United States Congress on March 2, 1966, took cognizance of the urgency of solving this problem; and

Whereas at the present time no maximum standard of aircraft noise has been formulated or adopted by the Federal Government, and no agency or department possesses the authority to regulate aircraft noise; now therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission, operators of Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport—Wold-Chamberlain Field, that:

1. This Commission hereby finds and determines that noise created by the operation of present jet aircraft is a problem of serious proportions not within the control of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission as a local governmental unit;

2. This Commission is convinced beyond doubt that means and methods presently exist to reduce aircraft noise to a level acceptable to the communities at which jet aircraft operate.

3. The Government of the United States should accept Federal responsibility for the control and consequences of aircraft noise because of the congressional declaration that the airspace is public domain (Congress by such declaration has assumed the responsibility and duty to control in all respects the users of the airspace);

4. The President's Science Advisor, with the administrators of the Federal Aviation Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, should take steps toward the sound resolution of this problem by legislative recommendations to the Congress.

5. The Congress should act as quickly as practicable upon the recommendations of the President or, in the alternative, on its own initiative confer upon the Federal Aviation Agency or other body or group, in its wisdom, the authority to establish and promulgate a maximum standard of aircraft noise in perceived noise decibels or other acknowledged standard and to vest the authority and power in the Federal Aviation Agency or other appropriate body, to enforce adherence to such standards by all aircraft operators, or take such other action as will result in effective discipline over the total problem;

6. The President's Science Advisor, the administrators of the Federal Aviation Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, take cognizance of the urgency of solving this situation and make provisions for receiving an expression of the views of representatives of national association or organizations comprised of State, County or Municipal Governments; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the U.S. Senators representing the State of Minnesota, the Congressmen constituting the Minnesota Congressional Delegation, the President's Science Advisor, the administrators of the Federal Aviation Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the President and Executive Director of National Association of Counties, the President and Executive Director of National League of Cities, and National Association of Municipal Law Officers and other interested organization, and that the Executive Director of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission inquire periodically as to any affirmative action or lack thereof on this matter so as to keep this Commission informed concerning the reactions of the recipients of this Resolution.

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

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I might state that the congressional district which it is my honor to represent is subject to noises that seem incongruous as a result of the helicopters going from La Guardia and Kennedy Airports to the New York central area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are residental areas and are also business areas. These noises disrupt the life of the people and the life of the business community which is extremely important.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] is very salutary and in my opinion should be accepted.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN], such time as he may require.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 15963, the Department of Transportation Act, as a necessary advance in the ever increasing struggle to meet the complex demands for improved transportation.

As I stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 16 at page 19568, during the debate in the House on the mass transit bill—H.R. 14810—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 we can meet the transportation problems of tomorrow. Our first order of business, however, is to meet the pressing needs of today.

One of the most pressing needs of today which we have failed to recognize is for the abatement of excessive noise, whatever the source.

It has been suggested by some of my colleagues that the proposed legislation before us today is deficient in that it fails to deal with the subject of aircraft noise abatement.

I concur with and commend those who would take active steps to abate aircraft noise.

I would be remiss, however, if I failed to caution my colleagues against being somewhat nearsighted about what they hear.

Aircraft noise is a serious problem. It is, however, one of a whole series of complex sources of excessive noise. To the city dweller, for example, the din of the helicopter flying overhead and the din of the air compressor and pneumatic drill outside his apartment window at 7 a.m. are both serious.

On April 21, 1966, I introduced a bill—H.R. 14602—which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 21 together with my statement and related studies and articles at pages 8745 through 8768 to provide a comprehensive study of the complex noise situation in the United States with a view toward a better understanding of the detrimental effects of excessive noise.

My bill would establish an Office of Noise Control within the Office of the Surgeon General. The Office, headed by a Director and assisted by a Noise Control Advisory Council, would provide grants to the States and local governments to research ways and means of control, prevention and abatement of noise.

The Office of Noise Control would cooperate fully with existing Federal agencies presently working in the specific field of jet aircraft noise abatement, and would prepare, publish and disseminate educational materials dealing with control, prevention and abatement of noise.

I am pleased that there has been considerable response to my noise pollution bill. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2 at pages 12191 through 12205 and August 4 at pages 18233 through 18257, I have set forth editorials and letters on the subject, together with additional studies and articles of interest to those concerned with noise.

Presently, FAA is primarily concerned with noise research from the perspective of where and how the planes fly. NASA seems to be primarily concerned with the mechanical generation of noise.

It is my firm belief that the notable research and admirable work being carried on by the FAA, NASA, and CHABA—Committee on Hearing and Bioacoustics—should be centralized to insure greater efficiency and more benefit to all those interested in the general field of noise abatement. We can no longer afford to go off in several different directions in our effort to reduce excessive noise.

We must develop a central unit or "noise information clearinghouse" where the efforts of all the present agencies working with jet and helicopter noise can be combined and coordinated.

If we were faced only with noise from vehicles and planes used in transportation, it would seem logical to place a central office of noise control within the bill to establish a National Department of Transporation, before us today—H.R. 15963. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 2 at pages 9470 through 9477 I set forth detailed studies relating to excessive noise caused by trucks and automobiles on our Nation's highways.

The fact is, however, that excessive noise is coming from several sources which have nothing to do with transportation as such.

As I stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3 at page 9679 during the debate on Congressman WYDLER's excellent amendment to the NASA appropriation to provide $20 million toward jet aircraft noise reduction, we must be careful not merely to appropriate a blanket amount of money to be used for jet aircraft noise abatement without definite criteria, a well-planned program, and a systems approach with respect to controls.

One of the many types of controls which should be employed, for example, is the prescription of standards for accurate measurement of aircraft noise. I have today introduced a bill which would provide that the Administrator of FAA be empowered to prescribe such standards, rules and regulations with respect to aircraft noise abatement in the issuance, amendment, modification, suspension or revocation of any certificate. A copy of my bill is included at the end of that statement. I would stress, however, that this is only one small example of the overall program of needed controls.

The committee's decision to include in section 4 of the transportation bill a provision that the Secretary of Transportation conduct research on the problem is a good idea but little more. What we need is an immediate and all-out effort to launch a vigorous and imaginative program to deal with the general problem in all areas of noise pollution.

A copy of my bill on the question only of setting Federal aviation aircraft noise standards, follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title VI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1421–1430), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"AIRCRAFT NOISE CONTROL AND ABATEMENT

"Standards, rules, and regulations

"SEC. 611. (a) The Administrator is empowered to prescribe and amend standards for the measurement of aircraft noise and to prescribe and amend such rules and regulations as he may find necessary to provide for the control and abatement of aircraft noise, including the application of such standards, rules, and regulations in the issuance, amendment, modification, suspension, or revocation of any certificate authorized by this title.

"Notice and appeal

"(b) In any action to amend, modify, suspend, or revoke a certificate in which violation of aircraft noise standards, rules, or regulations is at issue the certificate holder shall have the same notice and appeal rights as are contained in section 609, and in any appeal to the Board, the Board shall consider the aircraft noise violation issues in addition to the safety and public interest issues as provided in section 609."

SEC. 2. That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the center heading "TITLE VI—SAFETY REGULATION OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 611. Aircraft noise control and abatement.

"(a) Standards, rules, and regulations.

"(b) Notice and appeal."

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], 10 minutes.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15963.

I believe that few of us would deny the fact that our transportation system is in need of overhaul today. While the airlines are beginning to prosper, the railroads are in ill health and our merchant marine is dying. While we have developed a successful interstate highway system, our urban thoroughfares are choked and urban mass transit is decaying.

Transportation—as a vital public necessity—has been regulated by the Government almost since its inception. But, regulation has been piecemeal and patchwork. Over much of our history, we have concentrated upon individual modes of transportation, instead of looking upon each mode as part of an integrated system. Thus, in seeking to assist one form of transport, we have sometimes injured another. This approach, has, in too many instances, jeopardized the health of the entire industry and has also impeded the traveler and the shipper who generally must rely upon more than one form of transportation.

By establishing a Department of Transportation, there would be created the means for fashioning a coordinated and unified approach to transportation. Promotion, research, safety, planning and development could be approached on functional bases which cut across individual model lines. Economies and advances in technology, developed in one form of transport, would in the future be more rapidly and readily applied to others.

This does not mean, of course, that creation of the new Department would be a panacea. To the contrary, as I have pointed out in my additional views to the committee report, many shortcomings exist in the legislation, as reported.

H.R. 15963 does not deal, for example, with the issue of urban mass transportation. Rather, this matter is left in limbo for at least a year while metropolitan areas continue to strangle in transportation bottlenecks.

We are told in the President's message that the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development are to study this matter for a year and then decide where urban mass transportation should be housed.

But there is not one word in the bill which commands that these conversations be held, that establishes guidelines or priorities to be followed by the two Secretaries in their conversations, or that requires that a decision be reached within 1 year. This absence of clear direction and decisionmaking places in jeopardy the entire urban mass transportation program. Instead of deferring to this policy of drift, the committee should have resolved this matter before the bill was brought to the floor.

While it does not seem overly significant whether the responsibility for coordinating balanced transportation programs in urban areas is located in the new department or in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, it is deeply troubling that under this legislation the overall responsibility is located in neither department.

There is, as we all can appreciate from firsthand experience, a very close connection between highways and rail mass transit in urban areas and between transportation generally and other urban development programs.

If, therefore, we want to promote real balance between our highway and mass transportation programs—which should be a major objective—we must pay more than lipservice to the concept and provide a workable system for coordinating the two.

Moreover, we cannot have Federal highway officials, without taking into consideration all the factors which contribute to area growth, vetoing the carefully planned efforts of local communities to evolve their own development programs, including transportation.

Turning to the issue of air safety, the bill provides that the functions of the Bureau of Safety of the Civil Aeronautics Board are to be transferred to the new Department and are to be placed under the direct authority of the Secretary of Transportation. This could jeopardize the advances we have made in air safety in recent years.

In 1958, Congress established an independent Federal Aviation Agency which was to be responsible for control over the regulation of airways and over various promotional aspects of aviation. Among its duties, the FAA was charged with the responsibility for promulgating air safety regulations. At the same time, Congress also established an independent Civil Aeronautics Board which was given economic regulatory responsibility over civilian aviation and the responsibility for investigating aviation accidents.

Prior to 1958, both the duty to promulgate air safety regulations and to investigate aviation accidents was housed within the Department of Commerce. As my additional views point out, this dual responsibility proved unsatisfactory because it authorized one agency to sit in judgment upon its own mistakes. As a result, the state of aviation safety at that time was unacceptable. Since 1958, significant advancement has been made in the air safety record. Regretfully, we still experience most unfortunate accidents. But safety has improved and every effort is being made to improve it even further. A major reason has been the fact that when the Federal Aviation Agency has been found to have contributed to an accident, the CAB has not hesitated to say so.

Now, however, we are asked to return air safety to that unsatisfactory state which existed prior to 1958. The regulation of safety, along with other functions, is to be transferred to the Secretary of Transportation from the FAA. Similarly, the functions of the Bureau of Safety are to be transferred to the Secretary from the CAB. It is correct that the latter would be placed in a separate office of accident investigation. But, this office would be under the direct supervision and control of the Secretary. Thus, once again, accident investigation and safety regulation would come under the supervision of a single agency—an agency which would be charged with investigating itself. This should not be permitted to occur.

Another objectionable feature of the bill is its failure to deal effectively with the subject of noise abatement and air pollution.

A majority of our country's population now lives in metropolitan areas. Each year this majority grows larger. While metropolitan living provides many advantages, it also creates a number of irritants. Among the most serious are those caused by noise and pollution. And, of course, the transportation media are among the major contributors to both of these problems. In the case of noise, for example, the whine and roar from low-flying jet aircraft over residential areas is particularly disruptive of normal living. As for air pollution, the fumes emitted from cars, trucks, trains, and other forms of transportation can all but suffocate the city dweller.

The continuation and aggravation of these objectionable conditions will surely turn our metropolitan areas into wastelands. Yet these problems continue to be shunted from agency to agency and from official to official. No one will accept real responsibility. No one will take it upon himself to institute the necessary corrective action. Now is the time and here is the place to stop passing the buck. We are here creating a Department of Transportation. We are placing upon the Secretary of this Department the responsibility for operating, coordinating, researching, and planning the many separate facets of transportation. If we are to launch an effective program to eliminate the irritants caused by noise and air pollution, we should do it now by authorizing and directing the Secretary to exercise the necessary responsibility.

Finally, section 7 of the bill is open to serious question. By this section, the Secretary is authorized to promulgate on his own authority criteria and standards for the investment of Federal funds for transportation. I recognize that the breadth of this section has been considerably narrowed since its original introduction. Many investment programs have been eliminated from its coverage. But some investment programs remain affected.

More important, however, is the fact that the principle behind this section will remain intact; namely, that the Secretary will be handed the unrestricted authority to interpose his judgment over that of Congress as to how or whether money should be spent. In addition, the Secretary would be in a position to interfere with national transportation policy. Under present authority, only Congress has the authority to establish such policy. In this bill, we specifically provide that Congress retain this authority and only give to the Secretary the authority to recommend changes in policy to the Congress. But, if the Secretary retains the right under section 7 to transfer money from one program to another or to withhold spending money on a particular program, he could be in a position to affect transportation policy in the absence of congressional directive. In my opinion, the Secretary should not have such authority.

Aside from these defects and a few others of a more limited nature, this is a good bill. By correcting these defects, we can make it an even better bill. I believe that in establishing the Department of Transportation we can better perfect the Government's means of coordinating and improving the Nation's transportation network. Generally, I am reluctant to create a new department of Government since this has a tendency to escalate bureaucracy without improving efficiency. But, in this case, transportation has historically been regulated by the Government. By establishing this new Department, we are fashioning a means of streamlining and improving the Government's role.

Mr. Chairman, I urge enactment of H.R. 15963.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL.]

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and particularly in support of an amendment which will be offered tomorrow by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Transportation concept is something which has been proposed and supported by several administrations.

We are at last at the point where we may implement these suggestions and, if there is any doubt about the important place of transportation activities in our Government and in our economy, the recent airline strike should have clarified our thinking.

The purpose of this legislation is to bring together into one place for coordination and administration all possible aspects of transportation activities within the Federal Government. If this is our purpose, and I think it is and should be, the matter of aircraft noise control should be high on the list of the things requiring the coordination to which I refer.

The history of the Federal Government activities having to do with abatement of aircraft noise has so far presented a rather sorry picture. There have been abortive studies, long hear-

ings, proposals of legislation, considerable conversation, and large amounts of public frustration. In short, nothing much has been accomplished.

Consideration of the legislation we have before us today may be our one real opportunity to bring together all of the activities having to do with aircraft noise and to get some real action started on this problem.

The creation of an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement within this new Department of Transportation will not only bring about better coordination of Government activities in this field, but it will also make it possible for the public and the Congress to look to one agency and to one office for results in the solution of this problem.

In one of the many special studies which have been made on this subject, the President's Special Panel on Jet Aircraft Noise concluded a report in March of this year as follows:

> Initiative for solving problems of jet aircraft noise can effectively come only from a source not compromised by economic interests in conflict with those of the major groups now involved—engine and aircraft manufacturers, airline operators, and local governments. And there is only one source meeting this constraint which can be functionally effective—the Federal Government.

As my colleagues know, Washington National Airport, located just across the Potomac River in my northern Virginia district, is a vivid illustration of the need for noise abatement regulation at a more effective level.

The Federal Aviation Agency and its noise abatement staff makes a valiant effort to reduce noise in the Washington area resulting from National Airport traffic. But there is virtually no punitive action they can take against pilots who violate their procedures for staying within the prescribed flight pattern and/or climbing to prescribed heights before turning over residential areas. Voluntary methods can only accomplish a limited degree of success in spite of continuing agency pressure upon the airline industry and its pilots.

The FAA has even less success in the reduction of engine noise. It is quite natural that airlines under pressure from stockholders to make profits would resist use of mufflers or other noise abatement devices which would also reduce the amount of power output per gallon of fuel. It is natural, too, that engine manufacturers would direct the greater part of their research to improvements more directly connected with increased efficiency rather than into the problem of noise reduction.

An example of the weakness of the FAA in this field is a brochure recently sent to my office by the National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, the private industry organization interested in this problem. In some four or five pages of the bulletin, all information and advice was solely related to soundproofing of buildings against aircraft noise.

The Federal Aviation Agency has requested and received cooperation from the airlines flying in and out of National Airport to limit the number of flights by commercial carriers to 40 an hour, including both jet and propeller-driven planes. With the gradual changeover to jets it is both possible and probable that this will mean 40 jets landing and taking off each hour before long. In addition, unless this voluntary cooperation is backed with some enforcement authority there is bound to be more and more pressure to add to the number of landings and takeoffs which can be accommodated at National.

While the studies, proposals, hearings, conversations and frustration continue, those who live along the green valley of the Potomac suffer, as do all those who live in the immediate vicinity of any of our major city airports. The problem increases daily and the number of people affected increases accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support an amendment, which I understand will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], which would provide for the creation of an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement. I urge my colleagues to join me in making the creation of an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement an integral part of the Department of Transportation. The problem has been a lack of coordination and directed interest, and such an office can provide the focal point for action and solution.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to return for a moment to a discussion of some aspects of the amendment which the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], indicated he will offer tomorrow.

I believe it essential that we get this problem of jet aircraft noise in its proper perspective.

In 1962 I was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and of the Subcommittee on Aeronautics and Transportation. We conducted extensive hearings on jet aircraft noise. Subsequently; the following year, I was instrumental in securing a series of jet aircraft hearings, prompted by a very serious situation in this area in my own congressional district, which embraces O'Hare Field, one of the busiest if not the busiest airport in the world. It became evident, after many days of hearings, that actually there was no one in the Federal Government who was responsible for the welfare and the interest of the people on the ground.

The FAA generally, and I suppose properly, was primarily interested in the safety of the aircraft.

The local airport authorities did not have authority extending beyond the geographical confines of the airport.

The other people who testified before the committee, including the air lines representatives, felt that anything which could be done in this area had to be done primarily through improvement in engineering.

So at the close of the hearings it became quite evident that there was a void or a gray area in the matter of protecting the rights of many people on the ground who are constantly annoyed and who find the jet air noise a nuisance almost daily in their way of life, as well as to the schools and churches in the areas affected by noise on the ground.

We have spent millions of dollars over the years researching aircraft noise problems both civilian and military.

There are funds within the NASA appropriation, as we all know, to deal with jet aircraft noise through improved engineering.

Today this remains a serious problem in many areas of the country. I quite agree with the gentleman from New York in saying I believe Congress has a responsibility to delegate to an agency authority and to make it mandatory that they deal with this very serious problem.

I do not believe it is going to be done unless we specificaly direct through this legislation that it be done, and establish the power in an agency whose sole responsibility will be to handle the growing problem of jet aircraft noise in the space age in which we live.

I say to the gentleman from New York as one who has, incidentally, on two previous occasions, in the 87th Congress and again in the 89th Congress, introduced special legislation to establish a noise abatement commission, I will join him tomorrow in support of his amendment.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.].

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, I am, like everyone else who has spoken on this bill, for the concept of a Department of Transportation; but, unlike most of those who have spoken up to this point, I am opposed to this bill H.R. 15963, at least until the bill is cleaned up by action of this Congress.

I am a little like Sam Goldwyn who, when he was asked to be involved in a business deal that he really did not want to pursue because he felt it might be bad for business—but yet he did not want to offend anybody—said, "Please include me out."

I am not alone in wanting to be "included out" of this bill, because most of the industry people who testified, have also asked to be "included out." As a matter of fact, most of the Government agencies involved in transportation have succeeded in being "included out" as far as this bill is concerned.

The merchant marine, which is tied now to the Commerce Department, has asked to be "included out." It may have some difficulty in succeeding in doing this, but it certainly has made its case impressively to the Congress.

The Great Lakes carriers and barge lines in this country, fearing the executive's setting standards for transportation investment without congressional action, have also asked to be "included out."

The airlines, happy with the independent status of the FAA and the CAB and fearing overcoordination from the executive branch of the Government, have asked to be "included out."

The railroads, overregulated now but at least comfortable and trusting as far as the Interstate Commerce Commission is concerned, have asked to be "included out" of the proposed Department of Transportation.

Pipelines, not now as closely regulated and not wanting to be any more closely regulated than they are, have asked to be "included out" of the new Department of Transportation.

Trucklines, fearing the economics of perhaps inappropriate safety regulations, have also asked to be "included out" of the new Department of Transportation.

So let us look at the transportation industry for just a moment if we can. First, let us make note of the fact that businesses within each mode of transportation in this industry compete with each other. The different modes also compete with each other within the appropriate framework of Federal rules and regulations. They are not always satisfied, perhaps, with that Federal regulation, but at least most of them have grown comfortable with the independent agencies now in charge of regulating their rates, their routes, their rules of operation, and the safety requirements under which they operate.

These hitherto independent agencies which do this regulation job, compete in their turn with each other for the attention of the Congress. They compete for rulemaking legislation. They also compete for subsidy grants for things like harbors, airports, highways, riverways, and so forth—things that are of fundamental assistance to the successful operation of the various modes of transportation in our country. Each of these independent agencies and each of these modes has its champions within the individual membership of Congress. And each agency and mode has its champion within the committee organization of the Congress.

This is why the industries in each mode fear too much power in a single hand in the administration. Most of them have suggested that this power continue to reside in the Congress or in the quasi-independent agencies which Congress has set up to regulate the various modes of transportation for the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I think the reason for this fear is that they know the Federal Government—just like the grace of the good Lord—what it giveth, it can take away.

Mr. Chairman, we found this to be true in education, that what the executive branch of the Government controls, it can also withhold.

They also know that there are differences in the way some of the regulations can be applied. And, so, to yield safety regulations—which are economic in their base—and licensing control to the executive branch of the Government raises some areas of concern.

For the executive branch to set economic standards and criteria for the investment of Federal funds also raises some concern because then, if you do not have a champion in the executive department, your mode just might be in trouble.

And, Mr. Chairman, this bill also envisions the expenditure of a good deal more Federal time and effort and money in the area of research and development in the area of transportation in this country. If the research and development funds are being spent upon the mode of transportation of someone else and not yours, then you would like to have a champion, which you may not have in the executive department.

The influence of a Secretary of Transportation upon rates and routes set by even independent agencies can certainly be great, also.

So, we see the various industries involved in transportation in this country expressing their fear of the weighted impact of the executive branch of the Government controlling their industry.

What would happen should the executive lay heavier emphasis, for instance, upon air and highways than upon railroads and barge lines, or vice versa?

Now, Mr. Chairman, these decisions are fought out in the Congress in a public forum. Under this bill that seems unlikely for reasons upon which I should like to expand. The worst thing that could happen is that you might be completely forgotten like the merchant marine.

The "include me out" approach that I suggest industry representatives felt when they testified on this bill did not show up in the testimony of representatives of the executive branch of Government simply because we did not have very many people from the executive branch of Government who testified on this bill. Moreover, they had taken care of their "include me out" feelings on H.R. 15963—or rather, its predecessor H.R. 13200—in the gestation period of the bill within the executive department. Apparently in most instances they accomplished their purpose, because under this bill the Department of Transportation Secretary is precluded from developing standards and criteria for the evaluation of Federal investment in transportation in such areas as these and, Mr. Chairman, I quote directly from the bill: "Defense features included at the direction or upon official certification of the Department of Defense in the design and construction of civil air, sea, and land transportation" will not have the comment or the criticism of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation with reference to standards and criteria.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, Secretary McNamara has been successful in getting the Department of Defense "included out" of this legislation.

Also, Mr. Chairman, "included out" are programs of foreign assistance, because, apparently, Secretary of State Rusk was successful in getting his Department "included out" of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the interoceanic canal outside of the continental limits of the United States takes care of both Dean Rusk and Bob McNamara, because it is also "included out."

And, Mr. Chairman, as if that were not enough, practically everyone else in the executive branch of the Government is "included out" under this language now contained in the bill: "acquisition of transportation facilities for equipment by Federal agencies in providing transportation services for their own use" and will not be under the purview of the Secretary of Transportation in establishing standards and criteria.

Thus the Post Office, the General Services Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and others are "included out" of the Department of Transportation.

Grant-in-aid programs are also eliminated. So urban mass transportation and the northeast corridor now under the Department of Housing and Urban Development are "included out" of this legislation. We have already had considerable expansion of the questionable logic in that.

Finally, in the action of the committee at the last minute as a matter of compromise in order to get the Committee on Public Works of this Congress off its back, this legislation "included out" water resources. This took the Corps of Engineers out of the standards criteria which are to be set by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation.

The Coast Guard which now comes under the Treasury Department—at least in the organizational way that some of the other agencies are brought into DOT—is also "included out," because the Coast Guard is brought in as an organizational entity inviolate from the Department of the Treasury—and the Department of Defense under which the Coast Guard operates in time of war. Thus, the Treasury was successful in getting Coast Guard "included out" so far as losing its identity the way FAA and BPR lose theirs.

The Coast Guard, as a matter of fact, comes in as a sort of "fifth mode" of transportation on a coequal organization chart level with the highway, rail, air, and maritime administrations in the proposed Department.

The issue of the Federal Maritime Administration in the Department raises an interesting question. If it is stricken out by the action of the Congress, what happens to the Coast Guard? Who is the Coast Guard going to regulate under the Department of Transportation?

Mr. Chairman, we have obviously had many compromises to get this bill this far, and apparently some discussion of further compromise is going on at this moment with reference to the Maritime Administration in this Department. And it, too, may be successful in getting "included out" before today or tomorrow is over.

Now where do the agencies proposed to make up the Department of Transportation envisioned on this organizational chart come from?

First, the Maritime Administration. It comes from the Under Secretary for Transportation of the Department of Commerce to the Secretary of Transportation—and I understand also that he may even become the Secretary of Transportation if we create this Cabinet-level post. The Maritime Administration comes from the Department of Commerce where it has languished since 1950 when it was put in the Department of Commerce by a reorganization plan growing out of the Hoover Commission.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of course, has hit the ceiling on this move because it would rather have the Maritime Administration moved

away from the executive branch of the Government and closer to Congress.

Several of the representatives from the maritime industry have also expressed their opposition to moving to DOT as have the labor unions who work in the merchant marine industry.

The FAA and the part of the CAB to be brought under the Department of Transportation did not come from another executive department. As a matter of fact, there is very little in this bill that does come from other executive departments. The FAA functions and the part of the CAB functions which are to be transferred to the Secretary of the Department of Transportation come from the presently quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial and quasi-administrative independent agencies—FAA and CAB—which were established pretty much as arms of Congress.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been watching over the FAA and the CAB in this independent or quasi-legislative status. This committee did not testify on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, part of the ICC is also removed, transferred and split between the proposed Federal Rail Administration and Federal Highway Administration of DOT. These functions also come from an otherwise independent or quasi-legislative agency of the Government the independent agency which is now the ICC.

The Bureau of Public Roads comes under the Department of Commerce now, but its duties will move to the Department of Transportation.

This Bureau moves in the same way that the FAA will move. The Bureau of Public Works and the FAA will move in responsibilities only because they can be completely reorganized under the language of section 9(j), 6(a), 6(c) and 6(e) of this legislation.

Only the powers and duties of these two agencies are to be transferred. The Secretary is left with the right to reorganize them completely.

An amendment will be introduced to try to keep the organization of FAA and BPR unchanged after the transfer to DOT when we get to the amendments tomorrow.

But I would raise this point, Mr. Chairman. If the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee want the status of the Maritime Administration protected by moving it into an independent status, then it would seem to me that the Interstate Commerce Committee and the Public Works Committee might want to maintain the independent status of the FAA, the Bureau of Public Roads, the ICC, and some of the other agencies in which they are so involved.

The question was raised earlier about the use of user taxes in this area. Well, there was quite a bit of conflicting testimony, on whether or not ultimately the Secretary of the Department of Transportation might be able to redirect some of these user taxes from highway, to other areas of transportation investment after the creation of this department.

The question of cost has been raised in the organization of this new department. The way the bill is written there is no limitation on the kind of reorganization that the Secretary of the Department of Transportation could make in some of these presently independent agencies when they come under his jurisdiction. And so it would seem to me that the cost question is openended, therefore.

So what this bill does not do is coordinate the executive branch activities now related to transportation. It does not say anything about the transportation activities of the Post Office, Defense, Housing and Urban Development, State, Agriculture, and the other Federal departments. It only coordinates under the Executive and the Secretary of the Department of Transportation many of activities of Federal Government affecting the private sector of our economy by taking the present Government activities in this private-sector area which have traditionally been the prerogatives of Congress and moving them into the executive branch of the Government.

Section 7—and if you have heard of this bill at all before today you have heard of section 7—sees the Department of Transportation Secretary prohibited from recommending standards and criteria in such executive branch areas of transportation as defense, post office, and so forth. But the Secretary of the Department of Transportation not only can recommend Federal investment in the private sector of transportation, he can set these standards. Under the way this law is drawn, Congress has nothing to say about it.

And the standards which the Secretary will set—make no mistake about it—will control much of the investment of Federal funds in the various areas of transportation.

Section 7(b)(1) on page 25, line 3 to 15, states that all reports prepared by other branches of the Government must conform to the standards and criteria which the Secretary sets, and so we will not have any "minority views" when the standards and the criteria are set.

Congress traditionally has made the final determinations on standards by which Federal investments and transportation policies are judged. Under this legislation the Congress will not make that final decision because there is no room for objection. The standards are set by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, after he has recommended them to the President and the President has approved what they will be. Those people in private industry who testified did not object—and I do not object—to the Secretary developing standard and criteria and recommending them, as long as he recommends them to Congress for congressional action. But the Secretary does not recommend to Congress; he recommends to the President, and the President approves the Secretary's standards, not the Congress.

Holy Pedernales, Mr. Chairman. It looks like the Corps of Engineers' decisions are now going to be made in the White House.

The Corps of Engineers' standards and criteria, with the cost-benefit ratio, formerly were recommended to Congress and accepted or rejected. And here we had the upper hand because we were a branch of the Government against only an agency of another branch of Government. But now we will be a branch of Government, the legislative branch, directly up against the executive branch, and who will control? My guess is that it will be the Bureau of the Budget. They will recommend and control which standards and criteria we will follow. Because, remember, under this legislation, all reports must conform to those standards and criteria set by the Department of Transportation. The Congress, in the final analysis, will just send the money.

No such power was granted to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development when that Department was created. As a matter of fact, it was not even conferred on the Department of Defense. But, as we know, the Department of Defense and even the Department of Agriculture, which was created in the last century, have given us recent examples of the Executive deciding on its own what it will do and will not do, regardless of congressional action to the contrary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Ohio an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. So, Mr. Chairman, we see the possibility of the Executive being able to set its own standards and criteria, and thus its own policies, and even the possibility of refusing to observe congressional policies.

I feel the integrity of Congress and perhaps even the balance of powers in the three branches of Government are at stake. If the Members believe this is not a political issue back home, then I suggest they discuss it with some of their constituents. People do not like their Congresses or their Congressmen to be merely rubber stamps for the executive branch of the Government.

In section 7(b), as noted earlier, other agencies are precluded from bringing in conflicting facts on transportation standards and criteria to those developed by the Secretary of Transportation. It will be somewhat like the good soldiers in the Defense Department, where they go along or get out.

The next step after this legislation is passed, as I see it, will be for the executive branch of the Government to submit a reorganization plan to bring in the rest of the activities now undertaken by Government in the transportation field. Thus the Department of Transportation Secretary will have the opportunity to be in fact a czar of transportation.

Perhaps it will be unnecessary to do that, however, because with Executive control of standards and criteria and Federal investments in rail, air, highway, and maritime activities, the rest of the areas in which Federal investments are made will be surrounded.

In my opinion section 7 should not be stricken from this legislation. It should be amended to say that Congress, and not the President, has the power to establish standards and criteria. An

amendment will be introduced to this effect.

I believe it is enough for the Congress to yield the quasi-legislative, the quasi-judicial, and the quasi-administrative duties of the present independent agencies to the Executive, and for the Executive to have in this new Department a direct line of control into the presently independent agencies which now deal with transportation.

The independence of the CAB will be discussed later on, I am sure, but it has been alluded to by my colleague from Illinois. The independence of the CAB will be largely vitiated by the fact that the independence in the investigation of accidents will be lost, by bringing this activity under the Department of Transportation's Secretary, so that he will have the power to control the expenditures for this formerly completely independent accident investigation activity. CAB will not have the unfettered opportunity to criticize other transportation activities of the Federal Government under this bill.

Congress will not be a watchdog in such areas any longer, because there will not be the opportunity for divergent views. So perhaps industries will speak up? There is no representation for a spokesman for any transportation industry in this bill.

What do the Assistant Secretaries and the Administrators do under this legislation? If anyone wants to find out, do not read the bill. We have to ask the author of the bill, because the bill is silent on this subject. The Secretaries are left in limbo, for the Secretary of Transportation to tell them what their assignment will be.

Research? Whom will we have appointed? A college professor? A labor union economist? Who will it be? It may not be—because the bill does not suggest that it will be—the representative of any mode of transportation. Who then suggests to the Federal Government with reference to transportation, and to whom do they suggest it? Apparently only to the Secretary himself. If there is a head of a trucking company who feels the Federal Government's policies are hurting his business, to whom does he go? He does not have any assured representation within the Department of Transportation and Congress does not determine standards and criteria for Federal investment any more.

H.R. 15963 is compromised in order to present to us a new model H.R. 13200, which was the original administration version. Frankly, it is just a little chrome added to the old steamroller.

There has been no industry testimony on H.R. 15963, and very little committee testimony, and very little testimony, for that matter, from the executive branch of the Government.

An allusion was made earlier to the Hoover Commission and the fact that the Hoover Commission recommended the formation of a Department of Transportation. I should like to clear up a point here, because my predecessor from Ohio in the seat I now hold was the author of the Hoover Commission and served on it. The Hoover Commission did not recommend the formation of a Department of Transportation. The Brookings Institute, which did the homework for the transportation area of the Hoover Commission, recommended the creation of a separate Department of Transportation. The Hoover Commission members turned down the idea and suggested that the Department of Transportation should be incorporated into the Department of Commerce.

And the first step was taken in that area. Do you Members know what went in? It was the merchant marine. What success has it had since the Maritime Administration went into that Department?

What this bill does is to give great powers from the Congress to the executive branch of the Government.

What it does not do is:

It does not spell out any transportation policy.

It does not solve transportation labor tie-ups. They are not even mentioned under this legislation.

It does not tell how highway carnage can be ended. It does put safety regulation in the new organization, but it does not say what we will do about it.

It does not improve the merchant marine at all. As a matter of fact, it leaves it at the same level as now, or below.

It does not help the sick and overregulated railroads. But it gives the railroads two masters instead of one.

It does not attack the problem of aircraft noise, so that airports can be located where the people are.

It does not accept the responsibility it ought to have in regard to mass transportation.

The author of the bill says that this bill is "a new organization, a new framework, and a new posture of government—a willingness to look at many interrelated transportation problems in a comprehensive way with readiness to grapple with them—a broad and enduring foundation upon which a national transportation policy can be built."

It gives the power to the Executive to do that or anything he might want to. It does not do much else.

The President was somewhat more candid in his message on this bill when he said:

> We have fallen short because our transportation system has not emerged from a single drawing board on which the needs and capacities of our economy were all charted.

Section 7 consolidates all the industry drawing boards of all the modes of transportation and moves them from the Congress to the White House.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

As I have listened to my good friend from Ohio [Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.], I have been astounded by his approach to the bill. If I wished to stand up in the well of the House and mention 150 things that did not pertain to the legislation under consideration probably I could do so. Many of the things to which he referred require statutory changes by jurisdictional committees. It is not within the jurisdiction of this committee to go into the statutory changes over which other committees have jurisdiction.

This has been one of the guiding principles of our procedure, not to step on the toes of other committees.

The gentleman speaks about section 7. He speaks about giving power to the Secretary.

The first three lines of section 7 are:

> The Secretary shall develop and from time to time in the light of experience revise standards and criteria consistent with national transportation policies,

That is on page 23. Now let us look at lines 10 to 16 on page 6:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize without appropriate action by Congress, the adoption or revision of a national transportation policy. Nor shall the Secretary promulgate investment standards or criteria pursuant to section 7 of this Act which are contrary to or inconsistent with Acts of Congress relating to standards or criteria for transportation investments.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They have to come back. They have to come back to this Congress to do these things.

Yes, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. How many of the standards and criteria for the investment made in transportation by the Federal Government are spelled out in existing legislation?

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute in order to answer the question of the gentleman.

All criteria and standards of investment that now exist still exist. No new ones will be allowed unless they are consistent with existing acts of Congress or, if they are not consistent with existing statutory acts of Congress, the Secretary has to come back to the Congress and get statutory enactment of the basic authority so that he can make rules, regulations, and criteria based upon that statutory authority.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. But the Secretary has the power under the language of section 7 to set those standards and criteria any way he wants to, does he not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, but not unless they are consistent with present statutes, criteria, and standards which have been approved by the Congress. If they go contrary to the existing statutes, then he has to come back to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I will pursue this further at another time, because I have now promised to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], and I do so yield.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15963 to create a new executive Department of Transportation. This measure will provide coordination for the vast programs our Government is already engaged in the field of transportation and produce greater effectiveness in the solution of the many knotty transportation problems still remaining.

We have made remarkable progress in providing for the transportation needs

of our country and its fast growing population on land, by water and in the air. The utter dependence of our economy and the welfare of the people on transportation systems is patiently obvious. One-sixth of our gross national product is accounted for by transportation. But important as it is and as good as it is, it is not good enough.

In the words of our President in his message to Congress earlier this year:

It is not good enough when it offers nearly a mile of street or road for every square mile of land—and yet provides no relief from time-consuming, frustrating, and wasteful congestion.

It is not good enough when it produces sleek and efficient jet aircraft—and yet cannot move passengers to and from airports in the time it takes those aircraft to fly hundreds of miles.

It is not good enough when it builds superhighways for supercharged automobiles—and yet cannot find a way to prevent 50,000 highway deaths this year.

It is not good enough when public and private investors pour $15 million into a large, high-speed ship—only to watch it remain idle in port for days before it is loaded.

It is not good enough when it lays out new freeways to serve new cities and suburbs—and carelessly scars the irreplaceable countryside.

It is not good enough when it adheres to custom for its own sake—and ignores opportunities to serve our people more economically and efficiently.

It is not good enough if it responds to the needs of an earlier America—and does not help us expand our trade and distribute the fruits of our land throughout the world.

The President said that America today still lacks a coordinated transportation system that permits travelers and goods to move conveniently and efficiently from one means of transportation to another, using the best characteristics of each.

It is obvious to me, Mr. Chairman, that greater coordination in the system is required, but before that can ever be accomplished there must be coordination in the Federal Government's own programs to aid our transportation system.

This need for coordination is widely recognized. The Wall Street Journal has expressed its amazement that because of our uncoordination the Nation's transportation web is not in worse shape. The Journal, and I might say other respected voices, cry that this bill does not go far enough. All functions, they say, both promotional and regulatory, should be in the Department.

Our friends in the Republican Policy Committee support the establishment of a new department but with reservations concerning various features of the bill.

We all recall, of course, that President Eisenhower called for such a department.

There is, then, a widespread consensus on the basic question of coordination and that an executive department is the proper instrument for such coordination.

This House has only last week expressed its continuing and vital interest in transportation problems by passing the Motor Vehicle Safety Act and the Highway Safety Act, both of which will have a profound impact on the excessively high accident rate in our country. Safety will be a prime objective of the new department and for this reason alone the bill merits passage.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has already detailed the composition of the new department. I will not repeat this to you. I think the organizational concept is sound from the point of view of proper governmental management. I do not think it is necessary or desirable to bring the regulatory agencies and their functions into the new department. These are quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial. They represent, as we all know, an extension of the power of Congress and carry on their activities better in independent status.

I would like to stress here two aspects of transportation not included in this bill. Many Members like myself are interested in the St. Lawrence Seaway and the promise this holds for the development of the trade and commerce of our inland States. Last Friday, 49 Members of both the House and Senate sent a petition to the White House requesting the President to postpone for a year any toll increases on the seaway so that Congress may have an opportunity to review our Government's role in financing and, we hope, strengthen the seaway by passing legislation to make permanent our Federal investment in that great development. In his message on transportation, the President proposed that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation be included in the new Department of Transportation. The Corporation was not put in the bill because legislation was not necessary to accomplish this transfer and the President could and would do it by Executive order after the Department has been established.

We believe this should be done and will be done by the President. We have been given a clear understanding on this question and have, therefore, not introduced an amendment to the bill such as has been proposed by a number of Members of the other body.

Furthermore, the importance of this great Corporation is such that when brought into the Department it should not be subordinate to any operating agency but should be on a par with the other operating agencies such as the Federal Railroad Administration, Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Maritime Administration and the Coast Guard. We want the record being made here today to show that we have assurances from the White House that the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation will not be downgraded in the new Department. It will continue as an operating agency and, as such, will report directly to the Secretary. Its needs will not, therefore, be lost sight of in the competition with other transportation requirements.

In submitting his proposal for a new Department of Transportation, the President did not include urban mass transportation. As all Members know, this program is now being administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. HUD is responsible for a unified Federal approach to urban problems. The Department of Transportation is responsible for a unified approach to transportation problems. Neither can work independently of the other in urban transportation. The two must participate in the important decisions that must be made, which will require the contribution and cooperation of both Secretaries. The President was unable to state with certainty at this time what the proper division of labor between the two Departments should be. He has said that after the new Department has been created he will direct the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of HUD to study the problem and recommend to him within a year the means and procedures by which the cooperation can best be achieved, not only in principle but in practical effect.

I believe the President has chosen a wise course. Urban mass transit is so intimately tied in with other urban problems that it seems to me that the program should remain with HUD. I do have an open mind, however, based on future developments after the new Department has been put into operation.

The Mass Transportation Act, now in conference between the Houses, not only increases the grant authorization but includes a proposal that I presented in committee directing the Secretary of HUD in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce to prepare a program of research, development, and demonstration of new methods of urban transportation. We are seeking new breakthroughs in this tough problem for our hard-pressed cities. The solution will probably depend primarily on new and radically improved methods. We cannot now be sure that transferring this program to DOT will be the answer. We need action, fast action on these problems. It may cause some delay to move it over.

In the Housing Act of 1966 that has been reported and is pending for action in the House, we give to the Secretary of HUD authority to achieve coordination of Federal programs in metropolitan development by calling on other Federal agencies to supply such data as he considers necessary and we require those other agencies to cooperate with him in carrying out his responsibilities. This would naturally include urban transportation and it may well be that under this authority the Secretary of HUD could adequately fulfill his responsibilities in successfully meeting the urban mass transit problem.

Thus, a strong case can be made for keeping mass transit in HUD and it would indeed be precipitous for Congress to transfer it to the Department of Transportation at this critical time.

The legislation before us is among the most important the Congress will act on this year. I hope H.R. 15963 will be passed by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Is there anything in the language of the legislation which we now have under consideration which says or even indicates in any way that what the gentleman just said is so, that the President will ask the Secretary of the Department

of Transportation and the Secretary of HUD to sit down together and make a study?

Mr. REUSS. No; there is no language in the act, but the President has strongly supported this. I have no doubt whatever, from my conversations with Secretary Weaver of HUD, that this study will probably be made and a recommendation made in no greater length of time than 1 year's time, and I would think the matter could then be resolved.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REUSS. I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. This is in the area then of faith, let us say? We just sort of take some of these things on faith that these will be done at some future date in all likelihood if things are right and if everyone is agreeable. And if there is no real objection at that time?

Mr. REUSS. I think we take this on a little more than faith, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio. In the first place, we have the considered and public statement of the President of the United States, and in the second place, Urban Mass Transit now is in the Department of HUD, and any time the Members of the Legislature feel that it should be transferred over to Transportation or any place else this, of course, can be done.

Mr. Chairman, the President is acting in good faith when he says he cannot now determine where the public interest will best be served. I myself would have difficulty making that decision.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REUSS. I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. These statements are not binding upon a future President nor are they binding upon the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, should we establish this Department and a Secretary is appointed?

Mr. REUSS. No. All that the President has said is that he is going to ask the two Secretaries to make a study and report back to him with their recommendations within a period of a year. However, he could submit such official report to the Congress at any time when in his judgment it is ready. It is open to the Congress at any time to make its judgment.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct, and let me read the words of the President of the United States in his transmission of March 2 with reference to his message on the subject of urban transportation. He stated as follows:

Urban transportation.—The Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development must cooperate in decisions affecting urban transportation.

The future of urban transportation—the safety, convenience, and indeed the livelihood of its users—depends upon wide-scale, rational planning. If the Federal Government is to contribute to that planning, it must speak with a coherent voice.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development bears the principal responsibility for a unified Federal approach to urban problems. Yet it cannot perform this task without the counsel, support, and cooperation of the Department of Transportation.

I shall ask the two Secretaries to recommend to me, within a year after the creation of the new Department, the means and procedures by which this cooperation can best be achieved—not only in principle, but in practical effect.

This is the President's intention. Of course, you cannot bind the actions of Presidents in the future, but we would not doubt the integrity of the President in saying what he wants to do because he is not only a man of integrity but it is also a matter of good sense.

We are looking at this problem in the cities within the confines of municipal areas. We have a special problem there which is completely different from the intercity transportation across the country from city to city.

They are studying this problem down there. They have already set up a group down there that are working on this problem and they are going to come back to us at the end of a year and give us a report as to whether it should be in the Department of Transportation.

Maybe they will recommend that it should be in the Department of Transportation. Maybe they will recommend that it stay in HUD. But at least at that time they will have to come before the Congress—and if they do not come voluntarily, I will take the responsibility to ask them to come before my committee at the end of the year and give us their report. I think they will do this without any special urging because Mr. Weaver has told me he will be glad to come and report to us at the end of the year.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have the assurance of the gentleman in the well and of my colleagues from California and the assurances he read from the President. The only way we could tie this down any further is to write it into the legislation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] has an amendment, or at least is trying to prepare an amendment. I might say I would not want to commit myself to it because I do not know what the wording will be. But we have had some very pleasant talks together about this amendment that the gentlewoman is working on and I am in accord with her purpose. If we can work something out that will be germane to the bill and properly placed within the bill, I would say at this time that I have no objection to the principle that is involved, although very frankly I think it is unnecessary. But I am of an open mind on the subject, I will say.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. I think if we can get it into the legislation, we would all be satisfied.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, if I may address myself to the point of urban mass transportation, which I know the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Ohio and the gentlewoman from New Jersey are all intensely interested in, I would like to give my own personal view, as one who is also intensely interested in a breakthrough in urban mass transportation.

I would hope very much that the problem of urban mass transportation could stay in HUD, where it now is, for some time to come. I say that not because I am mortgaged to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, but because they are now seized of the problem. They have been working at it.

Mr. Chairman, just this week this body, with bipartisan support, passed the Mass Transportation Act of 1966, which I trust will become law very shortly, a key provision of which was to impose upon the Department of Housing and Urban Development the task of working out within the next 18 months a 5-year crash program of research and development and demonstration of wholly new systems of urban transportation.

I think many Members feel in their bones that new technology must be evolved if we are really going to untangle the traffic jams of our cities.

It would be a bad blow to the expediting of this program if the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which has been working on this for many months and holding conferences with experts from all the great industries of our country and from our great universities, were suddenly to be divested of this jurisdiction, and if it should be lodged in the Department of Transportation or in some other place which, being a fledgling department, simply would not be set up to do it.

I am sure we would lose a couple of years of momentum which we so desperately need. I would hope my friends on the minority side would take that into account should they decide to offer an amendment on this point, and take into account the imperativeness of going forward with research and development on new systems of mass transportation.

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

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I think the gentleman would agree with me that if we have a crisis in transportation in this country, it is in the area of urban mass transportation. Our greatest problem lies right there.

Mr. REUSS. I completely agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Certainly any solution to that problem will have to be coordinated with our overall transportation system. We cannot ignore the modes of transportation that are bringing people and goods into the central cities, and any urban mass transit program that we develop must be coordinated with our system of highway, aircraft, railroad, and other modes of transportation.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman is so right. Just as urban transport has to be coordinated with other forms of transport, so the forms of transport have to be coordinated with the transit problems

of our cities. The two are really indistinguishable parts of a whole. If we follow logic on the subject, we would say, "Let us have just one glorious Cabinet department which will handle all our problems."

Inevitably there are overlaps. They can be settled only by sympathetic coordination. Whichever way this thing goes, a year from now it will be the job of the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and others to see that that coordination is obtained.

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

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman has made the point, and the point was made by administration witnesses in our hearings, that this is a new program. The Housing and Urban Department Act was passed only last year and that this is a new program. Therefore, we should let it grow where it is. Congress made a conscious decision to put it in the Housing and Urban Department program last year. Obviously the Congress was not presented with the choice last year of putting the urban mass transit program either in the Department of Transportation or in the Housing and Urban Development Department, because we had no Department of Transportation.

The point I would like to make is that if this is a fledgling program which should not be ripped up by its roots, then what is the rationale behind taking the Northeast Corridor, the high-speed rail program, out of the Department of Commerce, which is also a new, fledgling program, ripping that up by the roots and putting it in the new Department?

Mr. REUSS. I will be glad to try to answer that question.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Let me suggest an answer, and that is that we are developing the personnel for this new program. If we are developing the personnel for a new program, why not let this personnel and the program be developed where the program will ultimately rest, instead of having it start here and then moving it over, with the resultant dismay to those involved in it?

Mr. REUSS. I think the gentleman begs the question when he says that the mass transit program will ultimately rest in the Department of Transportation. We do not know. I want to wait to see what the study develops a year from now. It did make sense, since the Department of Commerce was being very largely relieved of its transportation functions, to take the Boston-to-Washington high-speed railroad out of that Department and put it in Transportation. It is also true that the high-speed Boston-to-Washington railroad related to railroads generally in intercity transport, and it will go to the new Department of Transportation.

I think, however, there is a vital difference between that and urban mass transit, where we for several months have been getting started and are gathering momentum and building up a staff on urban mass transit.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute, whether he wants it or not.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman, but I think I have divested myself.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to point out that on page 15 of the report the following statement appears:

> The President has said he intends, upon the creation of the Department of Transportation, to ask the heads of the two Departments concerned to study and report within 1 year on a logical and efficient organization of urban mass transportation functions. It may well be that these functions will be lodged in the new Department. The committee considers that the President's proposed course is reasonable and that the final organizational decision on urban mass transportation should be deferred.

Until this study is completed.

Mr. REUSS. That says it in a nutshell. The matter should be deferred until we know what we are doing.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have no great conflicts in principle here.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I have considered it a privilege and a pleasure to serve on the Government Operations Committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] and to work closely with the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] on the Military Operations Subcommittee.

Also I want to take this occasion to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN], for the very patient time that they have spent in bringing to the floor this very important piece of legislation. Knowing the gentleman from California, and having worked with him on the Military Operations Subcommittee of this committee, I know how thorough he is. I know, from having worked with Mr. ERLENBORN also on another subcommittee, of his thoroughness in this legislation. I know both of them have spent a great amount of time, as have other members of the subcommittee, in bringing this bill to the floor.

I want to indicate that I support the bill and I expect to vote for it.

I recognize that the establishment of a new department certainly creates problems, and this bill certainly does have some problems. I have signed the additional views, which are on page 79 of the report which accompanies H.R. 15963. I invite my colleagues to read those additional views, in which I was joined by seven other members of the minority. These views point out some of the problems with respect to this bill.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer an amendment to promote labor-management harmony in the transportation industry which will direct the Secretary of Transportation to assist in promoting industrial harmony and stable employment conditions in all modes of transportation. The Secretary also would be responsible for informing the President of the status of labor-management contracts.

I am not suggesting another labor agency nor does the Horton amendment propose to interfere with or in any sense replace or duplicate the existing agencies concerned with labor-management relations.

My plan is an "early warning system," and my amendment would make constructive counsel available to labor and management before difficulties reach the point of work stoppages.

Collective bargaining is one of our fundamental freedoms. Government has a responsibility to help assure its vitality. Therefore, I believe our approach in Congress should avoid punitive actions that can only lead to erosion of this right. Rather, let us employ the resources of the Federal Government to induce cooperation and agreement.

Arthur Goldberg, when he was Secretary of Labor, expressed very well what I intend by my amendment. Speaking to the National Academy of Arbitrators at Pittsburgh in 1962, Mr. Goldberg said:

> The government must give better aid to collective bargaining not only through improved good office and mediation procedures but also through better and more precise economic data—data provided before the fact, not as a post mortem inquest; so as to assist settlements, not simply analyze them.

My proposal will offer this kind of aid through the Secretary of Transportation. Such impartial assistance would benefit both labor and management by advance detection of friction points. From this knowledge, I would hope the Secretary could work with the parties involved in a common effort to resolve problems before they grow, otherwise unattended, into crisis proportions.

The recent airline strike points up the fact that labor relations in the transportation industries are far from harmonious. Work stoppages in the airlines, railway, and maritime industries have occurred with some frequency. The railroads have had a bitter conflict regarding work rules. In the maritime industry, Taft-Hartley emergency disputes provisions have had to be frequently invoked, and with little success, for the strikes often went on after all the emergency procedures had been exhausted. Only in the trucking industry has there been relative quiet.

Since transportation has a crucial role in the Nation's economy, transport work stoppages are almost immediately a matter of national interest. If the strike is prolonged, the Government becomes more and more involved. Emergency boards and commissions are appointed. The public demands that something be done. Finally, if emergency procedures are exhausted, the only action remaining is for the President to act, or for special legislation to be passed.

In offering my amendment which directs the Secretary of Transportation to assist in promoting labor-management harmony in the Nation's transportation industries, I am impressed with the need to study labor legislation in the transportation industries. Such studies

could deal with, for example, inconsistencies in the present law. The railroads and airlines are covered by the Railway Labor Act while the trucking and maritime industries come under the National Labor Relations Act, including the amendments enacted in the Taft-Hartley Act. The National Mediation Board and the National Railroad Adjustment Board are concerned with the railroads and airlines, while the trucking and maritime industries come under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services.

As an article published 2 years ago points out:

> . . . Even students of labor relations are puzzled by differences in emergency dispute clauses found in the Railway Labor Act as compared to the Taft-Hartley Act. The employment of a Taft-Hartley injunction, as compared to the appointment of an emergency panel under the Railway Labor Act, results in a different procedure and time period for a "status quo" on the issues.[1]

Under both laws, however, transportation disputes have become what the Secretary of Labor has termed "marathons of maneuver." At a 1963 meeting of the National Academy of Arbitrators, he said:

> The last round of contract disputes in the airline industry (not yet quite completed) took over two years, and involved the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, the Under Secretary of Labor, the National Mediation Board, a Special Presidential Commission, nine Presidential Emergency Boards, and three Boards of Arbitration—a total of 36 public representatives.
>
> (In) the recent longshore case, the public participants, during its twelve-month course, were the President, the Secretary of Labor, an Assistant Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, his Deputy, fifteen FMCS mediators, a Taft-Hartley Board of Inquiry, the Attorney General, the Federal District Court, the Mayors of numerous port cities, a Special Presidential Board which was appointed but never convened, and another Special Board under the chairmanship of a U.S. Senator.[2]

Secretary Wirtz concluded then that "such a program of improvisation clearly offers nothing for the longrun future."[3] The airline strike, and the uncertainty as to how it was going to be settled, appeared to bear out this conclusion. Therefore, it seems imperative that more workable and consistent means be devised to deal with labor disputes in the transportation industries. The present legal and administrative machinery is inadequate.

It is true that many legislative remedies have been suggested. They tend to be drastic—for example, compulsory arbitration—and/or hastily devised because they are usually the result of a transportation emergency brought on by a labor dispute. However, I feel an "early warning system" in the proposed Department of Transportation could help come up with solutions which were arrived at through careful study of the complex issues involved.

Legislation is, of course, not the only or final answer to labor disputes. Good will and effective communication between the parties involved are also necessary. My labor-management amendment, in fact, directs the Secretary of Transportation to assist in promoting better relations between labor and management in the transportation industries as a supplement to the good offices of the National Mediation Board and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

The major justification for assigning this new authority to the Department of Transportation would be to put increased emphasis upon a problem area in transportation. The first stated purpose of the Department of Transportation Act—H.R. 15963 as reported by the House Committee on Government Operations—is to provide leadership in identifying and solving transportation problems. I believe the Horton amendment could make a major contribution to this goal.

When it is offered, during the amending process, I urge my colleagues to support it so that we can have this additional tool in this crucial area.

Again may I state my belief in this bill. It is important for us to establish a Department of Transportation in order that we can have one uniform Federal policy respecting national transportation.

I believe it is in the national interest to have this Department. Even though we do have problems, which I am sure will be ironed out during the amending process, this is a good bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute for the purpose of expressing my appreciation for the hard work that he has done on the Subcommittee on Military Operations, for his devotion to duty, for his attendance at the sessions, and for his always constructive approach to the problems which we have in that subcommittee. The gentleman knows how highly I regard his judgment. I will look forward tomorrow to seeing the context of his amendment, and I will give it every consideration that I can in relation to the integrity of the bill.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I have never been an enthusiast about increasing governmental agencies. In fact, on previous occasions, I have opposed the establishment of new Federal departments simply because of a desire to slow down, rather than accelerate, the pace at which governmental activities and bureaucracy are expanding.

All of us know that governmental agencies have a way not only of perpetuating themselves, but of expanding both their personnel and the areas of their jurisdiction. Frankly, I think that Government is much too big and I wish there were some way we could decentralize it. But I am also conscious of the fact that as our national economy becomes increasingly complex, centralized direction becomes increasingly necessary in some areas, especially those which require regulation.

The field of transportation is such an area. It was inevitable that there would have to be Federal regulation of transportation by rail, by air, and by water. It was equally inevitable that major responsibility for the planning and financing of roads and highways would have to be undertaken by the Federal Government as would the regulation of transport traffic over the Nation's highways.

Heretofore, these highly important elements of our transportation industry have been scattered in a wide variety of independent agencies and some have been parts of governmental departments where they have been comparatively insignificant subordinate elements. Transportation is a tremendously important part of our economy, and there is such an inseparable interrelationship among the differing but competing modes of transport that a coordinating authority is needed. Such coordination, it seems to me, can best be provided by a new Federal department, headed by a Secretary with Cabinet status.

During committee consideration of this bill, my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] and I offered an amendment which was adopted by the committee that will leave with the Interstate Commerce Commission its present powers and functions in railroad "car service" matters. I consider this to be one of the more important amendments made in committee because such matters which often involve quasi-judicial determinations should be left with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There is much more to "car service" than getting freight cars to points at which they are needed. Numerous provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act vest the Commission with certain powers and authority over "car service." Some of those sections apply only in times of car shortages or emergency conditions, while other sections have general application and apply to the everyday operations of the railroads. All of these sections are, in a sense, interrelated and deal directly with the economic regulation of the railroad industry. In addition, car service, in its broad sense, includes such matters as demurrage, or car detention, and charges for these, along with the rules, regulations, and practices affecting such charges, are published in public tariffs.

Thus, the so-called car service functions reach deeply into the economic regulation of the railroad industry. Such economic regulatory matters should properly rest with the Interstate Commerce Commission and should not be placed in the hands of an executive or purely administrative agency.

Another point I want to discuss has to do with the placing of the Maritime Administration within the new Department.

I have the honor to represent a district where transportation is a major industry.

---

[1] Shils, Edward B. Transportation's Labor Crisis. Harvard Business Review. May/June 1964, p. 96.

[2] As quoted in Kaufman, Jacob J. The Railroad Labor Dispute: a Marathon of Maneuver and Improvisation. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, January 1965, p. 196.

[3] Ibid, pp. 196–197.

My district is a maritime district. We boast the finest harbor in the world—Hampton Roads. We also pride ourselves on unexcelled shipping and shipbuilding facilities, as well as personnel who are outstanding in maritime services and operations. The first job I had after graduation from college was with a steamship agency. Through the years I have learned the importance of shipping to our Nation—the importance of our merchant marine, not only to the economy and commercial well-being of our country, but as an urgent requirement of our national defense.

In recent years I have been deeply concerned about our merchant marine, about the way it has been neglected, about our failure to pursue the policy officially set forth in our Merchant Marine Act. I shall not attempt to place the responsibility for this, but you and I have witnessed a rapid decline in the American merchant marine. We are not operating the ships that we should be operating. We have lost our position of leadership. Not only are we not operating the number of ships we should be operating, but we are not keeping our fleet modern—we are not building the ships we ought to be building. In short, although there is statutory authority to make the American merchant marine second to none, that statute is not being carried out.

Who can say how much of this is due to the fact that the Maritime Administration is just a little wheel in the big Department of Commerce? Who can say whether the lack of emphasis on new ship construction is due to disinterest on the part of the Secretary of Commerce or to the inability of the Administrator of the Maritime Administration to secure the kind of support he has needed?

Let me comment briefly on the proposal advanced by some of our colleagues to establish an independent maritime agency outside the Department of Transportation. I know that they are motivated by an earnest desire to try to promote our Nation's maritime interests and to try to restore Maritime to its proper place in our national picture.

I, too, share that desire, but I am convinced that the best way to accomplish that objective is to make the Maritime Administration one of the major components of the new Department of Transportation. Then that new component should be staffed by aggressive, competent top-level personnel who can enlist the full cooperation and support of the Secretary, and through him have access to the White House and employ persuasion with the Bureau of the Budget.

Unfortunately, none of us can say with certainty where Maritime would function best. It is a matter of judgment. But in recent years we have witnessed the transition of a number of agencies from independent status to constituent parts of two new Departments. I believe that the lines of communication for these constituent agencies have been improved and I think the voice of Maritime would be stronger when the needs of our merchant marine are expressed by a Cabinet officer instead of merely by an agency administrator.

Under the bill, the Federal Maritime Commission would retain its independence as a quasi-judicial agency just as the ICC and the CAB would. This is entirely proper, and quasi-judicial functions should be separated from the responsibilities of the Secretary of Transportation. There is some question in my mind about the desirability of including in the new Department the responsibility for determining maritime subsidies which are of a regulatory nature, and may involve quasi-judicial determinations. It is my understanding that an amendment to establish an independent subsidy board may be offered, and as I understand that amendment, it seems to me to be a desirable one.

All in all, I think the bill before us justifies support, and that the administrative functions of the agencies which it embraces, including Maritime, can best be discharged by the new Department headed by a Secretary with Cabinet status.

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

Mr. HARDY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I compliment my beloved friend on his fine talk, but I must say that it is the first time in a long time that I must respectfully disagree with him.

Mr. HARDY. That does not make the gentleman right.

Mr. DOWNING. That does not make the gentleman in the well right either.

Does the gentleman believe it was wise when we passed Reorganization Plan No. 7 and we were told it would be helpful to the merchant marine—for you will recall that this was when they placed the merchant marine under the Department of Commerce and great things were supposed to happen to the merchant marine—but they have not. Would the gentleman agree with me that that was a mistake?

Mr. HARDY. Insofar as subsidy determinations are concerned, I am inclined to think that they should never have been placed in an administrative agency. I had some questions about that at the time.

I had some questions about this particular aspect of the matter at the time. As I recall it, when the reorganization plan was considered by our committee, I raised some questions about it. I think, however, we were given assurances that there would be adequate safeguards. I am not at all sure that it has worked as it should have. However, let me say this to my friend, I do not think the problem with our merchant marine stems from the fact that it is in the Department of Commerce, I think it stems from the fact that there has not been enough interest in the executive branch of the Government to give us the kind of merchant marine we should have had.

I put an editorial from the Norfolk Virginian Pilot newspaper in the RECORD yesterday. That editorial wound up with this observation, which I think is a very valid one:

> It is ultimately a Presidential responsibility.

If we have Presidential support for a sound merchant marine that would be our national policy. It does not make too much difference whether it is in the Department of Commerce or in a new department or whether it is an independent agency.

Without that we are still not going to get the kind of merchant marine we ought to have.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, in that respect I am very much in accord with the gentleman.

However, I am fearful that placing the merchant marine administration in the Department of Transportation will have the same result as when we placed it in the Department of Commerce and nothing good will come out of it. In my opinion, it is like transferring a body from one grave to another.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, let me comment just briefly on that, if I may. Actually as I stated a moment ago, I do not think it makes too much difference where it is. If it does not have support in the highest administration circles, Maritime is not going to get its place in the sun. However, a fault that I find with the present situation relates to the making of subsidy determinations which to my mind does have some quasi-judicial aspects. I think if that were removed from the administrative agency, it would be an improvement. However, I do not think the fact that this was placed in the Department of Commerce is responsible for all the ills of the merchant marine today.

The real trouble is that Maritime has not had the blessings of the top administrative people.

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

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman completely on his analysis of the plight of the maritime program.

Now it is well to go into some history. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] back in 1950, I believe it was—his committee made a complete analysis or scrutiny of the action of the Maritime Administration and came up with an interesting report. So interesting in fact that when Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950 came before us, there was not a disapproving resolution filed by the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries or any other Member of the House of Representatives and it automatically became the law.

Then, again, when Reorganization Plan No. 7 was considered, which was in 1961, our departed friend, the Honorable Herbert Bonner, came to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], and expressed his interest in the matter. The Committee on Government Operations voted to table the disapproving resolution introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr.

MONAGAN] at that time, and the matter was brought up on the floor on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], and in the debate on the floor Representatives CELLER and Bonner strongly supported the reorganization plan.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman is correct in his recollection that a subcommittee which I headed in 1949 and 1950 did make an extensive study of the Maritime Commission as it was then operating. I do not know whether our study had anything to do with the reorganization plan that was subsequently offered or not. I do know, however, that there were some shortcomings in the administration of the maritime program at that time and there was serious need for improvement. I cannot say whether there is any relationship actually between the reorganization plans of 1950 and 1961 and the deplorable situation in which Maritime now finds itself.

I am inclined to think its present plight is due more to neglect and disinterest in high places than anything else.

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

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

Mr. LENNON. I direct my remarks to the gentleman from California, who commented on the statement and position taken by a former beloved friend and chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, and call the attention of the House to the fact that the last official act of the late Herbert Bonner was to stand in the well of this House, after the introduction of a bill calling for the establishment of an independent maritime agency, and making the statement that he had made a grievous and grave mistake when he supported Reorganization Plan No. 17 in 1961, just to keep the record straight.

Mr. HARDY. I recall that that is an accurate portrayal of the situation. Whatever we do, Mr. Chairman, I think all of us are interested in improving the status of our American merchant marine. That is certainly my motivation.

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

Mr. HARDY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Going back to Reorganization Plan No. 21 in 1950, which moved the Maritime Administration from an independent agency into the Department of Commerce, at that time under the Reorganization Act there was created in the Department of Commerce the position of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. That particular reorganization plan spelled out the responsibilities of the Secretary of Commerce to establish and promulgate a policy on transportation. It has not been done yet, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. HARDY. I must comment on that briefly.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hope the gentleman's comment will be brief, because I have an agreement for the Committee to rise at 5:30.

Mr. HARDY. That being the case, I will withhold the comment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman can conclude with his present commitments to speak before 5:30, I will ask that the title be read and then move that the Committee rise.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I do not believe I have more than 20 minutes of time requested.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the creation of a Department of Transportation and the continued operation of the Coast Guard as a legal entity within it. I have asked for this opportunity to speak not only to voice my own support but to try to allay any apprehension there might be about uprooting this service originally established as a part of the Treasury Department by Alexander Hamilton in 1790. I speak as one who has served 4 years with the Coast Guard during World War II and also from my experience as an officer of the Coast Guard Reserve. I am pleased that those entrusted with maintaining the traditions of the Coast Guard have expressed full support for the transfer of the Coast Guard to the new Department of Transportation. In testifying before the Committee on Government Operations, Vice Adm. William D. Shields, former Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, stressed five special advantages accruing to the Coast Guard by this transfer:

First. The Coast Guard will be a part of an executive department whose sole objective is in an area in which the Coast Guard operates continually, that is transportation and transportation safety.

Second. The Coast Guard will be in the mainstream of development of national transportation policy.

Third. Coast Guard prestige at international conferences dealing with transportation will be enhanced by the Coast Guard being an integral part of the Department of Transportation.

Fourth. The resulting closer relationships with other elements in the Department of Transportation will improve Coast Guard capabilities.

Fifth. Coast Guard personnel would serve in positions within the Department of Transportation at high levels of policymaking and administration.

It is further to be stressed that the Coast Guard is the only Government agency being brought into the new Department which is to preserve its identity as a separate unit. As the committee report specifically points out on page 24:

> So far as the Coast Guard is concerned, while it has a traditional link to the Treasury Department, its primary civil functions relate to maritime and to some extent air transportation. Now that a separate Department of Transportation is being set up, that Department is the logical home for the Coast Guard which, under the bill, would still remain as a separate unit in its present form.

It is essential that in view of the fact that during wartime the Coast Guard becomes a military service under the operational control of the Navy, and that its status as a complete entity should and must be maintained at all times.

That the Department of Transportation is the new, natural home for the Coast Guard is especially appropriate since the Coast Guard is the agency of the Federal Government principally responsible for safety in the maritime field. As transportation safety is to be a particular concern of this new Department it is imperative that the Coast Guard have an effective voice in policy questions affecting standards and procedures regulating our sealanes. As Vice Adm. Paul E. Trimble, at the time Chief of Staff of the Coast Guard, testified before the other body:

> Because of our important missions in the search and rescue field and the aids to navigation field, and the maritime safety field, and others, it was apparent from the outset that the Coast Guard is an essential member of the Transportation family.

Speaking for the Coast Guard Admiral Trimble added:

> I think we would feel like we were a second cousin if there were a Department of Transportation . . . considering transportation policy, transportation long range planning and research—(and) we were on the outside and not a part of it because of the part that we do play.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the relocating of the Coast Guard within the Department of Transportation will not adversely affect Coast Guard operations. Furthermore, there is a strong indication that it would actually be detrimental to the service and to the Nation if it were left out. I, therefore, support and urge my colleagues to support this section of H.R. 15963.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, a highly mobile population is probably the most distinctive feature of modern American society. Transportation today accounts for one-sixth of our $700 billion gross national product. It is therefore anachronistic and wasteful to maintain the current overlapping and uncoordinated collection of Federal transportation agencies. Valuable streamlining will be achieved by passage of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966.

This act creates a Cabinet-level Department with operating divisions embracing the major modes of travel. The Department will coordinate the 100,000 Federal personnel employed and the $6 billion in Federal tax funds spent annually for transportation.

In the long run, this consolidation will save the taxpayers' money. The Bureau of the Budget believes that budgetary economies, such as more effectively used computers, will completely offset within

2 to 3 years the cost of creating the Department.

All transportation problems will be more effectively attacked within the framework of the Department of Transportation. But one problem in particular will be given vitally needed special attention. A National Transportation Safety Board will work within the Department to try and awaken the American people to the high rate of transportation accidents.

Last year, 1,365 Americans died in Vietnam. The public was understandably concerned by each death. But where was the corresponding public concern for the 49,000 Americans who died in auto accidents during the same year?

Hopefully the National Transportation Safety Board will be able to break through the high wall of public apathy which currently surrounds this problem. This Board will carefully investigate the causes of accidents and then recommend appropriate legislation to Congress.

The Department of Transportation will also formulate consistent Federal policies governing investment in transportation facilities, just as the Water Resources Council now develops investment standards for water resource projects. Clear standards are needed to meaningfully evaluate the hundreds of transportation proposals brought before the Government each year.

The creation of a Cabinet-level Department is a large undertaking. But when 2.5 million Americans earn their living by moving people and goods, a large undertaking is required. Although we sometimes wish we could, it is impossible to go back to that period in history when only five Cabinet-level Departments were sufficient to run the affairs of this Nation. The Department of Transportation is necessary to help us keep pace with the growing complexity of modern life.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, 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. 15963) to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14596) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14921) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. Con. Res. 90) entitled "Concurrent resolution to authorize printing of additional copies of hearings."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8989) entitled "An act to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. FANNIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE ACTIONS OF MR. HAROLD HOWE II

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall that during the recent debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1966, several Congressmen brought to the attention of the House the high-handed, tyrannical, inconsistent, illogical and even illegal actions of Mr. Harold Howe II.

Now, I have news for the Members that the constitutional guarantee of a free press has been dealt a shattering blow in the State of Georgia by four junior bureaucrats from the U.S. Office of Education.

It has come to my attention that a four-man team from the Office of Education has been visiting with boards of education throughout Georgia telling them what must be done if they are to continue receiving Federal aid.

Despite the fact that the State of Georgia has an open-meetings law, and ignoring the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution, these representatives of the Federal Government have refused to meet in the presence of accredited news reporters. Members of the press have been expelled from meetings they have a legal right to attend. While the local school boards have defended the people's inherent right to be informed, the press has been barred at the demand of four political hacks, who were, on their own admission, carrying out orders from Washington.

These four men have stormed through Georgia with the diplomacy of a buzzsaw, disrupting our local communities and flouting the State's open meetings law. The team spokesman, who identified himself as James Rich, has taken the position that meetings between his uninvited group and local school officials can be compared to a jury session in which matters are understandably discussed behind closed doors. At least one school official told this emissary that he was not serving on a jury but rather attending a public meeting to handle public business.

Mr. Speaker, just in case any of my colleagues are wondering at this point why the local school officials and representatives of the press stood for such capricious and arbitrary treatment, I would like to remind my friends that the Office of Education holds a big stick over the heads of our educators. Through a bureaucratic interpretation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, our school boards are forced to bow and scrape to each and every silly demand of King Harold Howe II, and his numerous lackeys or face the withdrawal of Federal aid. Such action has served to strengthen rather than soften resistance toward the desegregation guidelines in the South.

The Georgia Press Association, which represents 227 newspapers in the State, has adopted a resolution expressing the indignation of the fourth estate. I have in my possession a copy of this resolution and selected editorial comments from the Georgia press which I would like to share with my colleagues.

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

A RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GEORGIA PRESS ASSOCIATION

Whereas the Georgia Press Association, representing 227 newspapers in the state believes the public has a right to know about all matters of the public's business, and,

Whereas the newspapers uphold the inherent constitutional right of the people to be represented in meetings wherein are discussed matters of vital public concern and interest, and,

Whereas the laws of the State of Georgia provide that public bodies, including boards of education hold open meetings and maintain open records, and,

Whereas the representatives of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare are currently holding meetings with local school boards in Georgia for the purpose of resolving difficulties with regard to desegregation of school systems, a subject of vital public interest, as acknowledged by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare itself, in specifically recommending certain steps to encourage community support for its student-teacher transfer policies, namely "meeting with civic groups, parent groups and church groups and the like to express the purposes and nature of the desegregation plan and transfer policy encouraging public officials and other community leaders to make public statements and otherwise provide for the desegregation plan and transfer policy" and,

Whereas certain representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, including one James Rich, have arbitrarily refused to permit representatives of newspapers and other media, as well as interested private citizens, to attend various local meetings of representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and local school boards when matters of guideline compliance were discussed, and,

Whereas said James Rich claims to have been instructed by superiors in Washington to discuss the above matters only in closed meetings, and,

Whereas the Georgia Press Association feels the public interest and orderly transition of Georgia's public school system can best be served in an atmosphere of free discussion, free exchange of ideas, open meetings and trustworthiness on the part of representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Georgia Press Association strongly protests the action of said James Rich and other representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and hereby calls on the executive branch of the government and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to instruct its representatives to cease the policy of secret meetings and abide by the laws of the state providing for free and open meetings of its respective school boards; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be provided the Executive Department, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Georgia Congressional delegation, the National Newspaper Association and all members of this association and respectfully request that this resolution be acknowledged.

Adopted unanimously this 13th day of August, 1966 by the Board of Managers of the Georgia Press Association, Atlanta, Ga.

ROBERT D. FOWLER,
President.

Attest:

GLENN MCCULLOCH,
Secretary.

[Editorial from the Dawson (Ga.) News, Aug. 18, 1966]

SCHOOL BOARDS AND HEW

School boards in Georgia which signed the new federal desegregation compliance forms with exceptions are finding themselves in pretty much of a predicament after all.

A team of four federal representatives—three white men and one negro—from the Office of Education are visiting the boards of education in those counties, telling them what they must do if they are to continue receiving federal aid.

In accounts of all the visits to boards which we have read or heard about, the press has been expelled though the federal Constitution and the laws of the State of Georgia provide that public meetings are open to the press, unless, of course, the national security is involved.

The expulsion has not been a decision of the county boards. The federal team simply has refused to discuss their business in the presence of the press.

In our judgment this is a flagrant violation of the American concept that the people have a right to know from an agency of our government which should be more concerned, above all else and all others, with compliance of the basic law of our country and a statute of the State of Georgia.

In effect, if not in reality, it would appear that the Office of Education considers itself above the law and that it has the self-appointed right to be prosecutor, judge and jury approaching a dictatorship.

It is indeed, a sad commentary on justice, when an agency of the government comes into a county and attempts to compel a school board to comply with an arbitrary ruling and then flouts the very law it is supposed to represent.

This team from Washington probably will skip Terrell County. Our County Board of Education declined to sign the new compliance form, largely as its only means of expressing disapproval. The board previously had agreed to desegregate the county school system under a "freedom of choice" plan which gave all school children equal opportunity. This, as we understand it, is all that the law requires and our county board of education was well within bounds in refusing to accept a mandate which could and no doubt would lead to more harassment and more stringent demands.

While we have little doubt as to the ultimate outcome of desegregation in our schools as well as those throughout the state and nation, we cannot help but commend our county board of education on the position it has taken. As honorable men who are trying as best they can to adjust a school system to a difficult if not unreasonable situation, they were left with no alternative and time has proven the justification of their decision.

Elsewhere in the columns of this issue are editorial comments of other Georgia newspapers who, like ourselves, are protesting the violations of the freedoms conferred upon the press and the public by an agency of our own government.

When the time comes that the government cannot discuss its affairs with and before the people, we begin to have fears of the future.

[Editorial from the Griffin (Ga.) Daily News, Aug. 12, 1966]

GRIFFIN DAILY NEWS STRONGLY PROTESTS CLOSED MEETING

The Griffin Daily News today protested the closing by federal officials of their meeting with the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education.

Editor Quimby Melton, Jr., took two actions. One, he protested the closed meeting to the Georgia Press Association with the request that it take immediate action to do whatever it can to see that public meetings of this kind are open to the public in the future. Two, he sent the following telegram to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington, with a copy to United States Senator HERMAN TALMADGE with the request that the Senator "see that it reaches the Secretary."

"Last night four representatives of the U.S. Office of Education, a unit of your department, met with the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education to discuss compliance with desegregation guidelines. James Rich served as spokesman for your officials. The meeting was held in a public building and was open to the public. Shortly after the board opened the meeting, Mr. Rich informed it that he had been instructed from Washington to meet with members of the school board only. The Chairman of the Board of Education stated that it was the board's desire that the meeting be open to the public and visitors be allowed to remain. However, Mr. Rich insisted upon his position and two representatives of the press and at least one person who was attending as an interested citizen withdrew. The meeting then proceeded. The Griffin Daily News protests vigorously the action of your representatives in forcing the closing of the meeting which was for the express purpose of discussing a public matter in a public building. Further, the Griffin Daily News respectfully but emphatically requests that personnel of your department be instructed that public matters of public concern should be open to the public.

QUIMBY MELTON, Jr., *Editor.*

[Editorial from Swainsboro (Ga.) Forest-Blade, Aug. 10, 1966]

LITTLE BIT OF AMERICA

(By Bill Rogers)

Nations do not die in a blinding flash. They quietly rot from within.

History has never recorded an occasion when a malignant growth in peoples' principles and ideals has run rampant through the bloodstream of a nation and rotted its heart out in a matter of hours.

Rather, nations die bit by bit, in small ways that at the moment seem inconsequential and unimportant.

America died a little bit in Swainsboro Monday afternoon.

At least an official of the U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare dropped the guillotine on a part of our nation's heritage when he totally rejected the concept that a free people have the right to know.

This government official was here with other representatives of "HEW" to attend a specially called meeting of the Emanuel County Board of Education. Purpose of the meeting was to give Health, Education & Welfare the opportunity to outline to the County Board what is expected of it in regard to the continued desegregation of the county's school system this fall.

The Forest-Blade was represented at the meeting of these two public agencies, a right guaranteed by Georgia law and in keeping with principles set forth by our nation's founding fathers.

The Emanuel County Board of Education promptly informed these visiting HEW officials that the Forest-Blade—as a representative of the people—had a legal right to be present and that not a single member of the County School Board objected to the attendance of the newspaper's representative.

But HEW official James H. Rich refused to discuss "anything" with the County Board as long as a reporter was present. He stated flatly that these were "his orders."

Your representative at that meeting—the Forest-Blade reporter—had no alternative within the bounds of decency: he could only leave.

The incident was a small one, but it evokes some rather serious questions that the people of Emanuel County—and others in our nation—deserve to have answered:

Why must the U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare conduct public business involving public money and centering around public school children behind closed doors at a meeting held in a public building and which was legally open to the public?

Surely it does not hope to hide the effects of its rulings on the Emanuel County School System. It couldn't think that the people of Emanuel County have no concern with what happens to their school children, their school system, their tax monies. And certainly this being an agency of the American government, it cannot feel that our people have no right to be kept fully informed!

Can it be that this unit of our national government is now so powerful and important that it no longer must observe basic American ideals, that it knows best what is best for the public and it feels that the public doesn't deserve and desire a first-hand report of its programs and plans?

It is true that we are a part of the South, that some of our people object strenuously to some of the programs of the U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare—but we remain under the impression that the South and its people are still a part of this nation, subject to its rules and laws certainly, but at the same time enjoying the rights and privileges of other citizens in other parts of the country.

These rights, we understand, include the privilege of knowing how and in what manner our public officials conduct our public affairs.

Certainly the rules and regulations being handed down by the government in the matter of desegregation of the public school system are matters of interest to all the public, both white and colored.

HEW (and every other governmental agency, local, state, or national) has the duty and obligation to instruct and inform the American people of its activities, its plans, its programs.

To do less is to destroy part of America—and less, much less was done here by the Health, Education & Welfare boys.

Indeed, you might say a little bit of our nation died here Monday afternoon.

[Editorial from the Metter (Ga.) Advertiser, Aug. 11, 1966]

FEDERAL MEN DEMAND SECRECY

The heavy hand of the Lyndon Johnson "Great Society" fell on Candler County again Monday of this week.

A four man team from the U.S. Office of Education refused to meet with the local Board of Education until two members of the reporting staff of the Metter Advertiser were removed from the meeting place.

Details of the meeting, as much as we know, will be found in this issue of the Advertiser.

We still believe that most employees of the government are the same as any other loyal citizen, but the employees of the U.S. Office of Education must be a rare breed indeed. If the attitude of these four bureaucrats is any indication of future action by the office of education, and we have every reason to believe it will be, we are in trouble, deep trouble.

Since the days of Valley Forge, Lexington and Concord, the freedom of the press to report the peoples' business to the people without hinderances, providing the national security is not endangered, has been a bulwark against everything the American Revolution was fought for.

When four federal employees can come to Candler County to tell our board of education what they must do to get our tax money back from the leaky federal pipeline to run our schools, there is something wrong, badly wrong.

The public schools are the peoples' business; how their policy is set is the peoples' business; the requirements of the Federal Government as they relate to the public schools is the peoples' business. The U.S. Office of Education seems to think by their action Monday they are immune from freedom of the press. The Democratic administration of LBJ seems bent on involving itself in every facet of each American's life, like it or not.

The highhanded tactics of any federal agency, and especially those of the U.S. Office of Education, should be protested by all citizens now and at the polls in November.

NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars national convention is presently being held in New York City. This organization is representative of all veterans of our Nation and of the entire American population as well. I think that it is fitting that the following two resolutions passed by this body be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the Members of Congress and the general public.

I should also like to place in the RECORD a resolution of the Council of Veterans Organizations of Greater Dallas concerning draft card burners and so-called peace demonstrations that give aid and comfort to enemies with which we are engaged in armed hostilities. The council has for some time urged the Members of Congress to take constructive action on the subject of their resolution:

AUGUST 24, 1966.

The following two resolutions were passed by standing acclamation attending the Veterans of Foreign Wars national convention in New York City. We urge that immediate action be taken on these two resolutions:

"RESOLUTION 258

"Resolution reaffirming support House Committee on Un-American Activities

"Whereas the Committee on Un-American Activities has long been a stalwart factor in the preservation of our Government against those who would subvert it; and

"Whereas the committee has been subjected to ridicule and criticism by those who fear to be exposed by the committee's investigation; and

"Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities has proceeded with dignity and determination in the discharge of its duties; and whereas, the committee continues to perform a vital and necessary function in our Government, by reason of the continuing efforts of forces who are at work to undermine the security of the United States: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the 67th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we commend the House Committee on Un-American Activities and express the appreciation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to the committee for the services it is performing on behalf of our country, and reaffirm our continued support."

"RESOLUTION 259

"Resolution requesting enforcement of law against un-American actions

"Whereas the United States is today fighting in Vietnam in defense of freedom and for our own survival; and

"Whereas the forces of international communism are pushing relentlessly against the free world throughout the globe; and

"Whereas from a practical standpoint we are now in a state of war; and

"Whereas U.S. servicemen are now fighting and dying in Vietnam; and

"Whereas certain persons and organizations, engaged in criticism of and protest against our U.S. Government policy of resisting Communist aggression in Vietnam and elsewhere, are by their unpatriotic actions undermining the position of the United States, encouraging our enemies and sowing seeds of doubt among the uncommitted people of the world; and

"Whereas those who are engaged in such activities against our Government are encouraging our enemies and thus prolonging the conflict, with the result that more of our servicemen are killed and wounded: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 67th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we urge the full enforcement of all laws applicable against such protesters, demonstrators, and critics; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge the enactment of such further legislation as may be necessary to outlaw all such unpatriotic and damaging activities against our Government in time of hostilities, including the prompt passage of H.R. 12047, now pending before the Congress of the United States.

"ANDY BORG,
"Commander-in-Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States."

COUNCIL OF VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS OF GREATER DALLAS AREA RESOLUTION ON DRAFT CARD BURNINGS AND DEMONSTRATIONS IN REGARD TO VIETNAM

Whereas, the United States is committed to aid Viet Nam and to help retain its integrity as a free nation, and American military personnel are now engaged in combat with the Viet Cong Forces who have been encouraged and aided by their Communist allies, and

Whereas, Americans are making great sacrifices on the battlefields of Viet Nam in carrying out our commitment to that courageous nation to stem the tide of Communist in Southeast Asia, and

Whereas, misinformed and confused students and others have been participating in rallies and burning their draft cards, thereby giving aid and comfort to an enemy of the United States, and which action is harmful to the morale of our American fighting men in Viet Nam and elsewhere, and

Whereas, many of the so-called peace demonstrations and protests are Communist, Nazi or Fascist inspired; desecrate the flag of our country and the principles it represents; and with utter disregard to the properly constituted authorities of local, state and federal government; and are planned to give comfort to the enemy of our country, and

Whereas, we are aware of the constitutional guarantees of the freedom of speech and the right of dissent of our citizens in a Democracy such as ours in this country.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Council of Veterans Organizations of Greater Dallas, composed of the American Legion, the United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jewish War Veterans, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of World War I, AMVETS, and the American GI Forum, meeting at Dallas, Texas, on this 6th day of April, 1966, supports our fighting men in Viet Nam, and condemns those who burn their draft cards, desecrate the flag of the United States, and participate in demonstrations that "border on treason", in time war; thereby giving comfort to the Viet Cong and their Communist Allies, while claiming the protection of the Constitution of the United States, and defying and violating the laws of our country, and

Be it further resolved, that the Council of Veterans Organizations of the Greater Dallas Area call upon the local, state and federal officials to use every means at their command to prosecute those who violate the laws of our country by burning their draft cards or participating in demonstrations that are injurious to the United States; and commit acts that are harmful to the morale of American fighting men in the Armed Forces of the United States, and the Council further urges that the Legislature of the State of Texas and the Congress of the United States enact such laws as are necessary and authorized by the Constitution of the United States of America.

Council of Veterans Organizations of Greater Dallas: United Spanish War Veterans; Disabled American Veterans; the American GI Forum; the American Legion; Jewish War Veterans; American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS); Veterans of Foreign Wars; Veterans of World War I.

Approved and adopted by the Council of Veterans Organizations of Greater Dallas, on this 6th day of April, 1966, at Dallas, Texas.

HYMIE GREENSPAN,
Chairman.

M. S. STEVENSON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

SAD, SAD CONDITION OF MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. GARMATZ. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday reports from Saigon told us about a Victory ship loaded with supplies for our Armed Forces in Vietnam being sunk by a mine. Even though that vessel was 21 years old, this country could ill afford to lose it, because our pipeline to Vietnam, shamefully, is composed primarily of ships 21 to 25 years old.

The great United States already stands sixth in the world in the size of its active fleet, but much further down the line for the conditions of that fleet, 85 percent of which is of World War II vintage.

Even the country of Liberia, not a maritime nation, will not permit most of the American merchant marine to be transferred to Liberian registry, because our ships were built before 1946.

This is, indeed, a disgraceful situation. Unfortunately, this deplorable picture is worsening, as has been illustrated in the Baltimore Sun the past 2 days.

For 1967, this country will be lucky if nine ships are built out of the budget appropriation. And our ships going to Vietnam are in such bad condition, and the skilled manpower availability so short, a crisis is at hand. The story is late, but let us hope we are not too late to keep Russia from burying us at sea.

The articles in the Baltimore Sun referred to above are printed herewith:

SHIP ENGINEERS SHORTAGE CITED—VIET WAR EFFORT THREATENED, UNION LEADER WARNS

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

CHICAGO, August 23—Unless the Administration declares shipping a critical industry and expends special efforts to draft skilled seamen to shipping jobs, the president of the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association (AFL–CIO) asserted today, at least 150 ships bound for Vietnam will be backed up in American ports within a month.

Fourteen vessels were delayed yesterday because of the lack of licensed engineers in San Francisco, New Orleans, Seattle, Galveston and Houston and "the situation is snowballing," Jesse M. Calhoon cautioned James J. Reynolds, Assistant Secretary of Labor.

"CRISIS IS HERE"

"The crisis is here and the war effort is threatened because of the failure of the Administration over the past many months to heed our warnings," Calhoon declared.

Calhoon said that, as soon as he could make a count today, he expected the number of ships backed up to be increased—"at fourteen to eighteen ships a day."

"If we are having this much trouble to man enough ships for 297,000 soldiers in Vietnam, think what's going to happen when we get up to 400,000 troops over there," Calhoon continued. "All of this can be blamed on the fact that the pipeline of ships to Vietnam in 1966 is composed of 25-year-old bottoms."

"TWENTY-FIVE-YEAR-OLD CARS COMPARED

"You can compare this to the trouble we would have if we tried to get by today on 25-year-old automobiles and airplanes.

"This is due to the lack of a maritime policy in this country and the failure to do anything about it."

The treatment of the seamen in the Vietnam area and the decrepit condition of the ships taken out of mothballs coupled with the general shortage of seamen were the reasons cited by Calhoon for what he described as the refusal of licensed engineers to take out any more ships for Southeast Asia.

Also he declared that the Victory ships broken out of the reserve fleet and now hauling supplies to Vietnam are going out in dangerous condition both because their equipment is faulty and because the number of skilled men aboard is short.

There are some 500 licensed engineers alone who have been graduated from the United States Merchant Marine Academy in the last five years after education at the expense of the Government, the MEBA official said, "and practically none of them have ever gone to sea.

"This is an untapped source of manpower, but nobody has made any effort to get them to do their duty to sail these old rust buckets to Vietnam.

"STILL DRAFT EXEMPT"

"They were draft exempt to go to school, then they got married and they're still draft exempt."

On top of this, he added, the Selective Service System is still on one hand drafting licensed seamen who are going to sea, and on the other releasing a few from the military forces to sail.

"What kind of a ridiculous situation is this?" Calhoon asked.

The Maritime Administration last April completed a manpower study which called for shipping to be declared a critical industry, the MEBA president claimed, but nothing has been done.

TOLD REPORT IS "ON DESKS"

"We have been told that report is sitting on the desks of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce without any action being taken yet," he said. "And here we are sitting on the verge of a national crisis, a national disgrace."

Even though his union changed its shipping rules in April to try to steer men first to those vessels without the number required by the Coast Guard, he said, the engineers who have been to Vietnam once, twice or more no longer will go.

NEW VESSELS' BUDGET DOWN TO BUT NINE—WILL BE LEAST UNDER REPLACEMENT PLAN SINCE 1958

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

CHICAGO, August 21.—Budget appropriations for new merchant ship construction for fiscal 1967 have "washed away" to nine vessels even before the first contract has been let, Administration forces are admitting privately.

This will be the smallest number of ships ever constructed under the nation's ship replacement program since it got fully under way in 1958.

When the budget was disclosed last January, the Maritime Administration stated that 13 ships woud be forthcoming from the $85,000,000 appropriated plus the juggling of some other funds.

Even that 13 figure was severely criticized because it was so small in a time of emergency when American-flag ships are in short supply to keep war materiel flowing to Vietnam and maintain this nation's commercial operations on a somewhat regular schedule.

PREVIOUS LOWS NOTED

Too, it was noted then that only in two previous instances—1960 and 1962—has the number of vessels to be built under the replacement program in the American merchant marine dropped as low as thirteen.

The replacement program is said to be more than 100 ships behind contract schedule, all due to budgetary cutbacks.

Uncle Sam pays the differential subsidy on new ship construction, which amounts to the difference in cost between building vessels in foreign yards and in the higher-priced United States yards. The differential paid out could be as much as 55 per cent.

New ships today are running between $16,000,000 and $17,500,000. Each vessel is larger and more sophisticated than the one she is replacing.

The initial request for new ship construction for fiscal 1967 was 25 ships by the then maritime administrator, Nicholas Johnson. The Secretary of Commerce, under whose jurisdiction the Maritime Administration functions, cut the number down to 17 when his department's budget was slashed $100,000,000 to provide more money for Vietnam.

The next hatchet-job was applied by the Bureau of the Budget, which eliminated four more vessels, bringing the number down to 13 "with qualifications."

THREAT OF TIGHT MONEY POLICY FOR ECONOMY OF NEW YORK'S 27TH DISTRICT

Mr. DOW. 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. DOW. Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke to you about the hearing I held at Goshen, N.Y. and about the threat the present tight money policy poses for the economy of New York's 27th District. At that time I stated that should present conditions continue the economic difficulties now being encountered by those in homebuilding and its allied industries would spread to other businesses and that as a result there is every possibility of a localized recession in our district by Christmas.

During the hearings several of those testifying were asked whether they attributed the decline in new building to lack of demand for housing. Everyone asked answered this question in the negative. They stated that in their opinion demand for houses was as strong this year as it had been over the past few years, if not a bit stronger. Instead, to a man and woman, they attributed the slowing down of homebuilding and real estate activity to the drain on funds caused by the high-interest policy now prevailing. Again and again those testifying reiterated that there was no mortgage money available.

Mr. James Bristow, a spokesman for five Orange County savings banks, reported his banks had experienced a net deposit outflow of close to a million dollars during the second quarter of this year. By contrast, he stated, in the same period of 1965, the same five banks gained almost $400,000 in deposits. Mr. Bristow then went on to point out that whereas the banks were making every effort to stay in the mortgage lending business, they were having great difficulty in the face of these deposit outflows.

Mr. Joseph Fersch of the Sullivan County National Bank, added that upcountry commercial banks were also having their difficulties in maintaining mortgage lending. A savings and loan

official testified that he was having trouble holding shares, especially larger shares in the $10,000 area, and that he might have to go after lending more profitable than mortgages out of duty to his shareholders if the present situation continued.

Several builders also testified that New York City mutual savings banks, which have previously supplied mortgage funds for certain of the larger development projects in Rockland and Orange Counties have disappeared from the market altogether, and, as a result, these subdivisions cannot be built.

In concluding his statement Mr. Bristow had this to say:

> I wish to make one point clear. We are not interested in placing new restrictions upon any financial institutions in order to benefit at the expense of others. What we are simply asking is that in competition for savings among financial institutions, instruments, such as the consumer type of certificate of deposits, should not be used to siphon off deposits from savings banks.

I agree with Mr. Bristow. I would add further, however, that this excessive competition he refers to constitutes an even greater danger, one larger in scope. For speculation is encouraged and thrift is discouraged. Stable relationships between thrift institutions and their customers, and a relative shift in incomes from those who produce goods and services by their own energy and effort, that is from labor, to those who hold idle funds for speculation is engendered.

The bankers and builders and others who testified at Goshen are buyers and sellers in the thrift market for money. This, to my mind, is a very important market, and one in which stability and good sense are necessary elements. Many savers, looking toward the future, put aside a small nest egg. They deposit these funds they have saved in savings accounts or they purchase shares in savings and loan associations. They are not speculators. The banks and associations serving them, including commercial banks with savings departments, lend these savings out as intelligently as they can, primarily in the home building and buying market. This is the service these bankers perform.

What they seek is a decent margin between the interest they receive from mortgage lending and the interest they pay out to shareholders or depositors. Let me emphasize again, this is not primarily a speculative market, and it should not be. Fair rates of interest and fair returns on services rendered are what is desirable.

We in this House are at present considering a number of bills seeking to correct the situation in the thrift market. In this we must avoid creating technical gimmicks that will only offer new outlets for the speculative fever. We must not contribute further to the high-interest acceleration, and thereby penalize those States such as New York which seek to maintain stable and reasonable interest rates in the thrift market through the so-called usury ceilings. We must hold the line against high rates and the chaotic market conditions which further encourage speculation. We must seek, instead, in our legislation, to reestablish an orderly market in mortgages and savings, so that our local savers and home buyers, bankers and builders, and their employees can turn again to the important task, the construction and purchase of decent housing.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. BERNARD A. SCHRIEVER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Forces of the United States will lose to retirement, on August 31 of this year, a brilliant military officer, Gen. Bernard A. Schriever of the Air Force.

The national success story of how he fought for and delivered to this Nation the awesome deterrence of intercontinental ballistic missiles is indeed well known. His military genius and dedicated foresight as commander of America's biggest research and development organization—the Air Force Systems Command—has maintained this country's free world leadership in aerospace technology.

However, to part for a moment from the great and visionary space and aerial hardware whose development he has managed, I would like to touch upon another little-known phase of his career without which this dedicated airman could not have successfully accomplished his staggering mission.

That facet is General Schriever's great accent on the people who have comprised his team. General Schriever has noted that the greatest challenge to management is to find ways to encourage the full creative potential of individuals, and that an atmosphere must be created where the unique human capacity for innovation and judgment can be fully developed and employed.

It is a validated fact that job satisfaction is the most important single factor influencing young officers to remain in military service beyond their obligation, and as commander of an organization which relies heavily upon the creative genius of fertile young scientific and engineering minds, General Schriever has continuously accentuated the fact that technology depends on the quality of people, their dedication, and job satisfaction. His foresight in motivating and recognizing the accomplishments of highly educated young officers has resulted in the retention rate of these vital young people being more than tripled in the past 5 years. It must be noted that such an accomplishment is a major feat when one considers that these highly educated scientists and engineers could easily choose more lucrative civilian pursuits than the lesser monetary rewards of military service.

General Schriever has said that the problem of retaining people in the Systems Command should be afforded the same priority and importance as the development of any new major weapons system. And so believing, he has innovated revolutionary personnel management techniques to implement such thoughts, including a dynamic accent on people program, and an officers' career motivation plan addressed to the junior scientific and engineering officers. These programs furnish the greatest possible personal recognition for these essential people, and furnish them a better place in which to live and work.

But the programs themselves were not sufficient to guarantee such a great legacy of responsibility, and to them General Schriever added his own brilliant hand and dynamic leadership, spending untold days over the years personally visiting his people throughout the Nation in a schedule that would totally exhaust a lesser man.

Ben Schriever has said that despite the talk of pushbutton technology, in the military it is the man who counts and not the button; that it is the uniqueness of human spirit and the ability of man to develop his God-given gifts that is the hallmark of American accomplishment and the measure of freedom for all men.

Such astute observations on the nature of man, and the inspirational ability to instill in the hearts of his people such a spirit of dedication and patriotism is indeed the mark of Bernard Schriever.

Timidity is the road to failure, and General Schriever has been neither a timid nor a despotic leader during more than 30 years of brilliant service to his adopted country. The Nation and the free world owes this great American a deep debt, not only for his foresight in developing America's weapons arsenal, but for creating a great and dedicated mental arsenal of technology, without which this country would be militarily backward indeed.

VIETCONG SINKING OF THE "BATON ROUGE VICTORY"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we learned that the Vietcong had succeeded in sinking a U.S.-flag cargo ship, the *Baton Rouge Victory*, apparently killing seven American crewmen and blocking one of the two channels into the harbor at Saigon. This is but the most successful of a series of attempts to mine ships carrying supplies needed to carry on the war.

These attacks appear to be taken in stride as normal hazards of the conflict. It is certainly in sharp contrast to our present meticulous policy of not impeding in any way Communist ships sailing into North Vietnamese ports. If we were to attempt to cut off the supply lines to North Vietnam it would be trumpeted as a sharp escalation of the

war. Where, I ask, are the cries of escalation when the Vietcong sink a U.S. ship and continue to harass the shipping lanes supplying our troops that are giving their lives to keep South Vietnam free? It is but another incredible example of the way we are fighting with one arm tied behind our backs.

Although the free world trade with North Vietnam appears to have been reduced the Communists shipping has correspondingly increased and we have not done anything to stop it that I know of. In fact, it was just in June of this year that we even as much as blacklisted Polish-flag vessels that had been to North Vietnam from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes. I am informed by the Department of Defense that during 1964 Polish ships made 48 trips to North Vietnam. During 1965 the number was 40, and while the figures for 1966 are classified I can say they appear to be at about the same level. Yet it was only in June of this year that we finally got around to officially protesting this trade. Furthermore, I am informed by the Maritime Administration that between January 1965 and June 30, 1966, 10 Polish-flag vessels have called at U.S. ports a total of 56 times. Mr. Speaker, I have joined a score of other Members in sponsoring legislation to close our ports to all ships of any foreign shipping interest which permits any of the vessels under its control to trade with the Hanoi regime. The administration has opposed this legislation, even though for a time it was given de facto enforcement through the extra-legal boycott initiated by patriotic longshoremen.

I say we cannot sit idly by and watch the war being continually escalated in South Vietnam by supplies entering North Vietnam in Communist ships. The Vietcong are not giving our ships any safe conduct passes up the river to Saigon but we, with the full might of the U.S. Navy controlling the South China Sea, just seem to drift about, paying no attention to the growing volume of Communist shipping that continues to sail to Haiphong to supply the Communists that are killing our boys and making it necessary for us to send more troops by the hundreds of thousands. The President should explain this to the American people.

FRANCIS X. BUSHMAN, A GREAT AND NOBLE AMERICAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Francis X. Bushman, who died at 83, in summing up his life said he had lived in the richest period of American history. He was 1 year my junior and our friendship began in 1912 when he was with the old Essanay Film Co. in Chicago and I was striving for my place in the political scene. Francis X. Bushman was one of the young men who helped me raise the cry of "Give Youth a Chance; Get Rid of the Old Fogies." That was the year that I won out over a field of seven others in the Democratic primary for Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and later was elected.

In 1915, we filmed "The Little Girl Next Door" at the Essanay studio at a cost of $6,000, and it went on to establish the alltime attendance record for a movie up to that time, and the only professional in the cast was a charming woman who later was married to Bushman.

For years a photograph of a scene in "The Little Girl Next Door" hung in my law office in Chicago as now it hangs in my office in the Rayburn Building. The last time I saw Bushman was in my Chicago office some years ago. He was as full as ever of colorful optimism and the merriment of just being alive. Looking at the photograph he said:

> No woman could wear shoes as she did. She had her own distinctive way.

Francis X. Bushman was never conquered by age. In his eighties, I am told, he was the same unconquerable, unsinkable Francis X. Bushman that I had known when we both were in our twenties and he was helping me on my political way. He was a great and noble American. With his passing the world that I have known—"the world of the richest period of American history," in his words—has narrowed.

AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3105, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (S. 3105) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader please explain to us the necessity for this, in view of planned committee meetings and other arrangements that have been made.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we have four conference reports which we would like to have considered tomorrow. We would like to finish this bill. We would also like to finish three bills that will not take much time, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. That will make it possible to adjourn from tomorrow until Monday; otherwise, we will meet on Friday.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, continuing the query, I am sure this has been cleared with the minority leader. May I ask the logic of coming in early tomorrow, in view of no business yesterday?

Mr. ALBERT. There is really no relationship between that and coming in early tomorrow. We had business scheduled for yesterday, but for good and sufficient reasons the chairman of the committee postponed it.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman did say it is his plan, if we finish the business tomorrow, to go over until the Monday following; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

TAKE-HOME PAY IS DOWN

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. 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, despite any and all claims to the contrary, the real take-home pay of the average American fell between the first and second quarters this year. It is almost certainly falling faster now.

Per capita take-home pay—adjusted for inflation—fell from an annual rate of $2,287 in the first quarter of this year to $2,277 in the second quarter. The figures I cite were prepared by President Lyndon Johnson's own Council of Economic Advisers.

I think this fact is important to every American citizen. I want him to understand where contrary figures come from: they simply ignore inflation. Without taking into account the spiraling cost of living, administration spokesmen tell you per capita income rose between the first and second quarters of 1966.

Here is what an independent news agency, United Press International, reported from Washington July 25:

> Higher taxes and higher prices more than wiped out whatever additional income Americans earned in the 3-year period ended June 30.

This is a fact and the cost-of-living figure of four-tenths of 1 percent increase during July means that the inflation-tax spiral continues to move up faster than the wage spiral, just as it did in the declining days of the Truman administration.

MORGAN GUARANTY SURVEY FOR AUGUST—ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. 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, some of the statements that we in Congress make about the inflation and the failure of the administration to deal with it effectively are bound to be dismissed as "campaign talk" by some of the cynical. But now a professional report confirms all we have been saying.

I refer to the Morgan Guaranty Survey for August issued by one of the major banks of the United States which is interested in economic facts rather than politics.

The slower rate of economic expansion that has been evident in recent months has not been accompanied so far by any significant abatement of inflationary strain—

The Morgan Guaranty Bank Survey reports—

Strain could have been avoided only if demand itself had been dampened earlier this year by a well-balanced program of fiscal restraint.

The fiscal actions that have been taken, featured by the acceleration of corporate tax payments, have proved clearly inadequate. Their chief result has been merely to reduce the borrowing needs of the Treasury while adding to those of private parties.

And the survey concludes:

Both demand and supply sides of the economy still are signaling inflationary potential and the need for fiscal restraint.

Mr. Speaker, what those last words mean in simple terms is that the administration should cease its wild and wasteful domestic spending while conducting a full-scale war halfway around the world.

MILITANT SOCIALISM

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. 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, President Johnson has publicly insisted—Thursday, August 18—that selective service should be brought up to date so that young people could be drafted for nonmilitary, as well as military, assignments.

This proposal to put the entire youth of the Nation under Federal command is nothing but militant socialism. It recalls the notorious Hitler Youth under the Nazis and the Young Communist organization in the totalitarian Soviet Union.

I have launched an investigation into reports that the administration is drafting a blueprint for economic dictatorship to be made effective right after the November elections. It is reported that wage and price controls, rent freezes, rollbacks, and industrial codes are all in the process of being drafted.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join many of my colleagues today in introducing legislation to establish a National Commission on Public Management. My bill is in response to the observation that the traditional Government approach to a complex Government problem is no longer adequate. The Commission proposed in my bill would enable us to acquire valuable insight into how to effectively manage Government operations while better utilizing technological advances.

Fragmentizing a national problem among several Federal agencies in the hope that none will antagonize each other in the process of drafting guidelines and regulations simply does not provide for comprehensive solution. What is needed is an indepth study of the application of systems management to the affairs of Government in the nondefense sector, and the proposed Commission would be a big first step in that direction.

We know that Federal planners treating only one aspect of a national problem are too often content with administrative muddying of the waters, instead of seeking fresh viewpoints of enlightened private enterprise. Under my bill, the Commission would investigate the proper role of Government and industry in the broad spectrum of national programs.

Private enterprise has been and should continue to be the backbone of our Nation's progress, and the systems management approach developed in the private sector should be utilized to the fullest in applying technology to implementation of Federal responsibilities.

We know, too, that scientific and technical information is now doubling every 15 years. Technology will continue to expand, and the Commission should anticipate its growth when delving into such areas as education, health services, law enforcement, and water pollution. Also, special attention would be given to the role of small business in the years ahead.

It is my sincere hope that the concept of a national commission to study the application of management techniques to complex national problems will gain even more support in the Congress. The opportunity to lay the groundwork for improvement in the operation of our Government should not be bypassed.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE NATIONAL SCENE

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. 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, the newspaper column, "Say It Straight," by Victor Lasky, provides its readership with a hard-hitting treatment of current events which sifts the wheat from the chaff. As both a columnist and an author, Lasky's forthright observations let the chips fall where they may in the tradition of objective journalism. His realistic approach to the issues of the day help to counterbalance some of the slanted offerings of the left. His column of August 20 provides a good sampling of Victor Lasky's wide range of interests. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER DELINQUENT IN TAXES

(By Victor Lasky)

NEW YORK, August 20.—Some things to think about on a Sunday afternoon:

One of the noisier civil right organizations, whose leader has a penchant for traveling to such exotic places as Cambodia, is in hock to the Federal Government to the tune of $200,000 in withholding taxes. Yet, the "Feds"—usually so forthright in tracking down transgressors—seem paralyzed in this case. Is this "Black Power" in action?

The key issue in the forthcoming elections may not be Vietnam as much as the rising standard of living plus increased taxes confronting middle-income families, according to an informal survey of GOP leaders across the country. This is borne out by a series of articles in New York's Daily News claiming that despite unprecedented "good times," middle-income New Yorkers are beginning to feel "poor." "And here lies potential social dynamite," reports the News. "For the city's families in the middle are beginning to blame the poor for the burden of taxes they bear."

Not all members of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) are happy about the group's efforts to obtain a court order blocking recent hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC). "I deeply protest your work to obtain a court order to prevent HUAC from carrying out functions which Congress must exercise in order to legislate," Basil Rauch, professor of history at Barnard College, wired the ACLU. "That HUAC abuses its power is no reason to try to destroy the independence of Congress. Fight abuses by Congressmen but stop your dangerous fight to establish judicial control over Congress."

Good point. But Rauch should recognize that HUAC is more sinned upon than the sinner in such cases as those involving the recent ejection from its hearings of an obstreperous lawyer who refused to sit down when ordered by Chairman POOL. The lawyer, incidentally, has a list of leftwing credits as long as Khrushchev's arm.

The smearing has begun in California's hot gubernatorial race. The Democrats have come up with a 29-page "exposé" of Ronald Reagan's alleged relations with rightwing groups. GOP Candidate Reagan is pictured as guilty of a multitude of sins including his membership "on a committee to keep the ultra-rightwing magazine Human Events afloat." No doubt Human Events is a conservative weekly, but any effort to link this responsible publication with the lunatic right is truly "McCarthyism of the left," as Reagan's backers observed.

And what of Gov. Pat Brown's "guilt by association" with leftwing extremists? Are we to consider the Democratic incumbent some sort of leftwing stooge because he is being supported by all sorts of undesirables

including the Commie-infiltrated California Democratic Council? For once, why can't a California contest be decided on the issues and not on the merits—or lack of them—of the tag-a-longs who apparently have hopped on the bandwagons of both candidates?

COMMUNIST TERROR: RED CHINA—PART 2

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. 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, on July 25 of this year I initiated this series of insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Communist terror with an article by Lowell Thomas which appeared in the Reader's Digest in December 1960, entitled "Terror in Tibet." The horrors visited upon the unfortunate Tibetans by the Red Chinese were outlined in detail. The purpose of this series is to provide a standard which will help all citizens determine what our policies toward Communist regimes should be; namely, the basic standard of Communist treatment of human beings the world over.

A review of Red Chinese history since 1949 is especially pertinent at the present time since a concerted drive is now underway in the United States to have Red China admitted to the United Nations. Of special interest was a news story on the first page of yesterday's Baltimore Sun which read as its title: "U.S. Weighing Reversal on China in U.N." The lead paragraph stated:

> Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg opened the possibility today that the United States may abandon its opposition to Communist Chinese membership in the United Nations when the General Assembly convenes next month.

Although it was stated that the United States would not abandon its commitments to Nationalist China and would not consent to ousting the Nationalists in order to seat the Communists, the mere consideration of ceasing our opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations is a departure from long established U.S. policy.

In anticipation of this drive to seat Red China in the United Nations, I inserted material in the RECORD on April 5, June 2, and June 28 of this year. Outlined in detail were the arguments against admission, along with a rundown on the various forces presently straining to admit this brutal bandit regime to a world organization where only peace-loving nations are eligible. On June 28 I pointed out, for example:

> Every indication points to the continuing success of our policy toward Red China and now, as a result, the Maoist government is in serious trouble. It has just suffered two devastating political setbacks in Indonesia and Ghana. The Red Chinese-supported Vietcong are being constantly frustrated in their attempts to overthrow South Vietnam. Internally, Red China is being smothered by overpopulation, its food distribution is erratic, and its industry is greatly overworked and creaking at the seams.

One of the basic arguments against the Red regime is the unbelievable brutality with which it has ruled the Chinese people. In 1952 there was published an eyewitness account of the Communist conquest of China by Rev. Raymond J. De Jaegher and Irene Corbally Kuhn entitled "The Enemy Within." As a Belgian missionary, Reverend De Jaegher had arrived in China in 1930 and witnessed the unparalleled savagery of the Red Chinese from 1937 through 1949. The chapter, "Communist Tortures," is a thoroughly appalling and sickening account of the bestialities experienced by Chinese people at the hands of their own Red Chinese rulers. If the experiences of this one Chinese community were an isolated case, the indictment of the Reds might justifiably be limited to the local Red authorities. But when the official policy of a government results in the slaughtering of literally millions of human beings throughout the country, the inhuman nature of the regime is almost beyond human comprehension.

Yet this is the same government which some will admit to the United Nations presumably as a peace-loving nation.

I include the above-mentioned chapter from the book, "The Enemy Within," in the RECORD at this point:

CHAPTER X—COMMUNIST TORTURES

One day I was sorrowfully concluding my morning duties in Ch'en Lu Che, one of the parishes under my care, whose priest had been arrested by the Reds. The big bell in the village sounded, and a frightened youth, who had been the priest's servant, came to tell me that the Communists had issued orders through the mayor to everyone in the village to assemble at an open place ordinarily used as a children's playground.

"You will have to go too, Father," the young man said. "Everybody must be there at ten o'clock."

The bell sounded again and its heavy, ominous peals depressed me even more. I questioned the boy, but he was too terrified to talk, so I decided to go along and see for myself what the Communists were up to now.

When I reached the playground I found the whole village assembled there, old and young, men, women, and children. The children, with their teachers, were in the front row. I inquired what we had been brought here for, and one man whispered to me:

"We are to witness an execution—a beheading."

His companion leaned over my shoulder and spoke in low tones behind his hand.

"It is a big execution. They say there are many—ten or more."

"What is their crime?" I asked.

"They have committed no crime," the man said with bitterness. "They are students. From the anti-Communist school in Chang Ts'un."

"Seu-tsuen School?" I asked, and I had to brace myself to stop trembling.

"Yes, that is right," the man answered. Then he pulled my arm. "Look, here they come! And see—the children! These beasts will make the children witness this horror!" The man shuddered, then spat violently on the ground in anger and disgust.

Memories came flooding of my young friend, Wang Chi-sien, a graduate of this school, buried alive when the Communists were systematically tracking down all its graduates. I prayed for strength; I reminded myself that I must be the coldly objective surgeon; I must not let my feelings and emotions overcome me. I must watch and observe and not let these Red devils prowling around up and down the lines of people suspect that I was sick with revulsion already.

The man behind me had said, "Here they come." I looked now and saw that a file of young men, most of them in peasant dress, hands bound behind them, were being led into the cleared space. They were all so young, so very young!

A Communist soldier barked orders at them, and they were all obliged to kneel down facing the people. The Communist barked more orders, and the young men moved closer to each other on their knees until they were not more than a foot apart. I counted them. Thirteen of them knelt there in the brightness of the morning, the wind from the northern plains blowing across their young faces.

These were the fine youth of China, the good, incorruptible ones, and they were going to be liquidated because they were incorruptible. The local militia, which had been guarding them, stepped back. A Communist officer read out a long rigmarole of charges against them. The word "traitor" kept jumping out of his mouth.

The people were silent. Contempt was written on their faces. Everyone knew these young men and knew they were not traitors. The Seu-tsuen School was a most democratic one. Its principal had conceived the idea of a half day of studies and a half day of agricultural work, a kind of practical training in new methods so that the students who couldn't go outside their province for an edution would at least have some knowledge and be able to read and write a little when they had to return to their fathers' farms. It had made wonderful strides in giving a little education to peasant youths who otherwise would have been entirely unlettered. Given time, it could have leavened all of the largely illiterate area with knowledge.

The people listening to the trumped-up charges knew, too, that even if these young men had wanted to be traitors they could have had no opportunity since there were no Japanese in the area.

With this curious sense they have of knowing just when to stop their tirades and diatribes and strike, the Communist leader now gave two orders simultaneously: he told the teachers, white and trembling already, to start the children singing patriotic songs. And he gave the signal for the execution to the swordsman, a tough, compact-bodied young soldier of great strength. The soldier came up behind the first young victim now, lifted his great, sharp, two-handed sword and brought the blade down cleanly. The first head rolled over and over, and the crowd watched the bright blood spurt up like a fountain.

The children's voices, on the thin edge of hysteria, rose in a squeaky cacophony of dissonance and garbled words; the teachers tried to beat time and bring order into the tumult of sound. Over it all I heard the big bell tolling again.

Moving as quick as light from right to left as we watched him, the swordsman went down the line, beheading each kneeling student with one swift stroke, moving from one to the next without ever looking to see the clean efficiency of his blow. Thirteen times he lifted that heavy sword in his two hands. Thirteen times the sun glinted off the blade, dazzling at first, then dully as the red blood flowed down over the shining steel and stained and dimmed its glow. Thirteen times the executioner felt steel pierce cartilage and flesh, slide between the two small neck bones. Not once did he miss. Not once did he look back at what he had done. And when he came to the thirteenth, the last man, and had chopped his head off, he threw the sword down on the ground and walked away without looking back.

I thought sardonically as I saw this through my own misted eyes that, inhuman devil that he was, he still believed in the

ancient Chinese superstition that if a killer looks on the man he has killed at the instant of his death, the soul of the victim, escaping from the body the instant the head is severed, will rush into the soul of the killer, who never afterward in all his lifetime will know a moment's peace. The cautious Communist was taking no chances; this is why he had beheaded the men almost without looking at them.

There were a few Chinese in that company of forced watchers who now rushed forward with pieces of *man tow*, the steamed bread of North China, to dip them into the blood gushing from the trunks of the beheaded youths. Some Chinese believe that if one has *ye che*—a weakness in the stomach—eating bread soaked in blood will strengthen the organ and cure the disease. Criminals were always beheaded in China in the old days and in modern times too, but it was rare for any Chinese to avail himself of the opportunity to test the gruesome remedy. The Communists, however, encourage the people in revolting superstitions like this. On this day, though, they didn't indulge them long. They had something they wanted to do themselves.

My eyes started from my head when I saw what the Communist soldiers did next.

Several of the strongest, most aggressive among the group rushed forward now and pushed the corpses over on their backs. I stared horrified as each soldier bent down with a sharp knife and made a quick, circular incision in the chest. He then jumped on the abdomen with both feet, or pumped on it over and over with one foot, forcing the heart out of the incision. Then he swooped down again, snipped and plucked it out.

When they had collected the thirteen hearts, they strung them all on a pointed marsh reed, flexible and resilient, which they tied together to make a hand circular carrying device.

The two villagers who had watched all this, too, turned looks of withering scorn on the departing Communists.

"Why did they do that terrible thing?" I asked the older one.

"They will eat the hearts tonight. They believe it will give them great strength."

And he turned away and cursed them violently.

"Look at the children," sighed the other. "Our poor children!" he said, shaking his head sadly.

The youngsters were pale and disturbed. A few of them were vomiting. The teachers were scolding them and getting them together now to march them back to school.

This was the first time I had seen small children forced to watch such bloody executions. It was all part of the Communist plan to harden and toughen them, make them callous to acts of barbarous cruelty like this, and terrify them with Communist power. Unhappily, it worked in many cases. After this I often saw children forced to witness executions. The first time they were horror-stricken and emotionally disturbed, often sick at their stomachs as these children were. The second time they were less disturbed, and the third time many of them watched the grisly show with keen interest.

The second ringing of the bell for the execution of the thirteen students of Seutsuen School was at ten o'clock. The beheading took about ten minutes. It was all over in less than half an hour, the violation of the corpses, the return of the children to school, the sad departure of the families of the young men with their desecrated bodies, and the dispersal of the crowds. Communism is most efficient.

On another afternoon in this same village some children came running toward me as I was walking down one of the back alleys. "Come quickly, Father!" they said, and I ran with them. On the main road, leading to the headquarters of Red General Ho Lung, were four Peking carts. These are the country carts, roughly made, without springs, and with two large ironbound wooden wheels.

I walked over toward the Communist soldier who was backing a mule into the shafts of the lead cart. Screams and wailing shattered the air, but there were so many villagers gathered, so many Communist soldiers and civilian stooges, that I couldn't see what was happening. Soon, however, all the carts were ready and the crowds parted to let the soldiers get in and drive away. Only then did I see in each cart a man nailed through his wrists and insteps to the floor of the vehicle. The Communist drivers whipped up the mules, shouted at them, and the cavalcade was off. The rough, rocky roads, so rutted and uneven, jolted the men and caused them almost intolerable pain; and the faster the mules went, the rougher the ride, the more terrible the pain. The Communists drove the carts at a furious pace through the village several times and then took off on the even rougher road to General Ho Lung's headquarters. There the men would be put out of their misery if they had survived the ride. Their heartrending screams echoed through the village. They reached my heart.

Every time I saw one of these acts of calculated barbarism everything in me cried out for some personal action on my part, some gesture of protest at least. Help I could not give. I had to remind myself of the role I had elected to play with God's help. I had also to remind myself of my own plans for counteraction to communism wherever I could follow them behind the front I had set up of the relatively helpless onlooker and observer. I kept detailed accurate accounts and records of everything I saw and heard, and I studied my notes constantly to discover the outlines of Communist plans and maneuvers. The more intently I studied Communist methods, the more I saw that while terrorism was the order of the day in those counties and areas which they had already brought under their control they were, simultaneously, launched on a much larger project—the conquest of all China.

They had a method of torture which served also to show their contempt for the National Government of China. They would find a good man, a patriot, one who had expressed sentiments favorable to the government, and would tie him by his hands to the topmost branches of the tallest tree in the neighborhood. Then they would gather below and shout up at him derisively, "Now do you see your friends from the National Government coming to help you?" If he said yes defiantly, a Red in the tree would lop off the branch and the victim would be dropped to the ground to his death; if he said no truthfully, they would mock his patriotism, revile the government, and drop him to his death anyway, with the excuse that he was a traitor! This kind of thing went on all through the war when the Communists were supposed to be co-operating fully and loyally with the National Government, and while they were sending out reams of propaganda telling the United States and Europe of their heroic deeds against the Japanese, their determination to free China from the invader, and their deep concern for the welfare of the Chinese people.

As time went on and the crescendo of terrorism mounted, it wasn't enough just to kill a man. The Communists added refinements of torture, sometimes formalizing them with descriptive names for identification, classification, and study by the butchers and sadists they were training in their indroctrination centers. Sometimes they forced a man to eat a great quantity of salt and then refused him any liquids until he died of thirst; sometimes they kept a victim under direct examination for twenty-four hours a day, constant, direct examination, until death came from exhaustion.

They had a method they used for quick death. The doomed man was brought from his home or office directly to Communist headquarters. A group of officials met him and escorted him into a room. "Now we will examine your conscience," one would say, giving the nod to another, who would step forward at once, ripping off the man's upper garments and cutting out his heart.

Sometimes the Communists forced a man to take off all of his clothes and roll over and over in broken glass, jagged ends fitted close together and set in irregular, upright rows in a bed of cement. In the winter, for a seasonal change, they would break the ice of the river in two places. They would drop their victim through one hole into the freezing waters and then tease him by showing him the other hole, a little distance away, as he came up gasping.

"You can come out here," they would shout as the man made a supreme effort and struggled under water to the other hole in the ice. As soon as he came up his captors would push him back into the water. Now he knew there was another opening and he would make for that one, hoping that they'd relent, but as soon as he came up they would push him back in. They did this over and over until the man froze or drowned.

At the other extreme was a frightful method which was the invention of a Communist in Shansi. On a tour of a city in his province one day he came to a halt before a food shop and stood transfixed for a long time before the big caldrons, or cooking pots, which the shop used to prepare food in quantity. The Communist ordered several of these, and when they were delivered to him he immediately arrested some anti-Communists. He conducted the usual kangaroo court, except that this was even more perfunctory and ludicrous than most. While the farcical proceedings were going on he had coolies fill the caldrons with boiling water. As soon as the trial was finished and he had pronounced his three victims guilty, he had them stripped and dropped into the caldrons to be boiled alive.

These utterly savage tortures were devised and practiced by the same barbarians who unconsciously paid tribute to the technocracy of the industrialized Western world they pretended to despise. Many a Chinese peasant who had never seen any of the modern forms of transportation which are commonplace in the West was introduced to the Communist version of them. The ignorant victim who was invited to board "the Peiping Express" discovered it was a short, rough ride indeed. His feet were tied at the ankles with a slip knot, and the length of rope was then fastened securely to the tail of a mule or a horse which was beaten viciously so that the animal ran at a gallop. The stones in the road soon fractured the man's skull. When a victim was invited to "go by plane" he was suspended by his toes and thumbs from the branch of a tree; and when his sentence called for him to "go by parachute" he was tied inside a sack, taken to a pagoda or a tower, or even a tall tree, and dropped from the very top.

A man whom the Communists wish to mock and injure severely but perhaps save for other tortures if he should survive is introduced to a little game the Reds call "the ape climbs the perch." He is stripped naked and ordered to climb a pole which is studded with sharp spikes. Often he can get to the top without doing himself much harm, but he has to slide down, and in the quick descent he is ripped to pieces.

In P'ing Shan I met a man whose father was skinned alive by the Communists. The son was held by two Reds, he told me, and forced to watch the awful process and listen to his father's screams of agony until he

died. The Reds poured vinegar and acids over the man's body so that the skin would come off quickly and make the job a quick and easy one for the devil assigned to this frightful murder. He began at the back, peeling from the shoulders down in long strips. The man was skinned entirely, except for his head. He died within a few minutes after the peeler had completed his gruesome task.

SAFETY IS ECONOMIC SAVING

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. 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, it is appropriate to do all we can to assure that we are as safety conscious as possible. As our society becomes more and more complex, the incidence of accidents might well increase. This probability should encourage us to minimize their effects and reduce their incidence. With all that is written about automobile safety, we sometimes forget that this type of accident is only a fraction of the accidents that plague us. Our safety campaigns must remain broadened to include prevention of accidents in industry, in the home, and in all areas of recreation. Some progress has been made in minimizing the effect of accidents, if not the ratio of incidence in these areas. In 1965 there were only 54.7 deaths per 100,000 population due to accidents as compared to the figure of 70.3 in 1942.

In spite of the great increase in mechanization and the use of machinery, the time lost from work because of accidents at least has not increased. The rate has remained around the 12.9 hours lost per million man-hours which attests to the many industrial safety campaigns. However, while there has been progress, more is clearly needed. For this purpose, I join my colleagues in introducing a resolution declaring the month of September National Safety Month.

CURTIS TEXTILE REPORT SCHEDULE FOR MONDAY, AUGUST 29, 1966; THE LONG-TERM COTTON TEXTILE ARRANGEMENT AND U.S. TRADE POLICY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. 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, because of the importance of textiles to every American family and because of the economic significance of textile agreements to American business and labor, I am going to give next Monday, August 29, a lengthy and rather complete report on the long-term arrangement regarding trade in cotton textiles.

All Americans use one form of textiles or another. From shirts to socks, from pants to handkerchiefs, the price, availability and quality of cotton textiles is a matter of immediate concern to working American families.

U.S. cotton textile policy affects Americans, but it also affects developing countries. This Nation has professed a deep concern with the economic development of nations attempting to modernize. We have undertaken a massive program of financial assistance to demonstrate that concern, but we have tended to ignore sound measures that could help developing countries earn their own livelihood through trade in manufactured and semimanufactured goods with the developed countries. We have given lipservice to the idea "trade not aid," but seem instead to have ignored it. My intensive examination of U.S. textile policy has convinced me that in this area "trade, not aid" is little more than a slogan. I will discuss this and other aspects of U.S. cotton textile policy fully on August 29.

POSSIBLE NEGOTIATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. 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, one of the important undertakings in the Kennedy round of trade negotiations concerns antidumping. Since June 1965, when I introduced House Resolution 405 calling for administration study of international antidumping code, I have urged our negotiators to pursue such discussions at Geneva. Earlier this year, discussions were held in Geneva among the United States, the European Economic Community, the United Kingdom, Japan, and other countries concerning the procedural and substantive issues involved in dumping. As a result of these discussions, all the countries involved have indicated a willingness to consider the possible content of an international antidumping agreement, or "code."

I have discussed these developments in remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—pages 5333 to 5336—and in my May 31 report on the sixth round of trade negotiations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—pages 11856 to 11869—on which I serve as a congressional Delegate. In this report I also considered briefly the economic condition of the cement industry, tentatively concluding that imports of cement, much less imports of dumped cement, did not seem to be a problem. As yet I have received no economic data from the industry to rebut my conclusion. Therefore I have asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare an economic analysis of the cement industry, including such subjects as the ratio of imports to domestic consumption, the sources of imports, costs of producing cement here and abroad, and measures of the prosperity of the industry including return on equity. I have requested this economic analysis in order to determine with some degree of impartiality the basis for the cement industry's claims of injury from foreign dumping.

In preparation for possible international negotiations at Geneva, the Trade Information Committee of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations will hold hearings on September 12, 1966, the notice for which was published in the Federal Register on July 15, 1966. This hearing is designed to solicit views of industry and other interested parties about the basic issues which would have to be dealt with in considering the possible content of an antidumping agreement.

Following publication of this notice, Mr. John Mathis, Chairman of the Cement Industry Committee for Tariff and Antidumping, sent a letter and legal memorandum to the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations—with copies to the congressional delegates to the Kennedy round—which concluded that the President could not enter into negotiations on an antidumping agreement through the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations and that the forthcoming hearing was legally invalid. The Cement Industry Committee for Tariff and Antidumping is the remaining fragment of a much wider coalition of certain industries, the purpose of which was to tighten the present Antidumping Act of 1921. A list of its cement industry committee's members provided me by Mr. Mathis will follow at the end of my remarks.

I have also now received from Ambassador Roth, the Acting Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, a copy of his response to the memorandum of the Cement Industry Committee, which also encloses a legal memorandum prepared by his staff.

Because of the importance of the issues involved in this discussion, and in order to permit all interested persons to consider both sides of the question, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD Mr. Mathis' letter, with its enclosure, and Ambassador Roth's reply, with its enclosure, and the list of members of the Cement Industry Committee on Tariff and Antidumping referred to above:

CEMENT INDUSTRY COMMITTEE FOR TARIFF AND ANTIDUMPING,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Longworth House Office Bulding,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CURTIS: Enclosed is the memorandum referred to in our telegram concerning the legal invalidity of the proposed hearings on the negotiation for an international antidumping code. We think that the legal authority supporting our position on each of the three points is quite clear. If you have any questions on any of them, however, please feel free to contact Donald Hiss of the Washington, D.C. firm of Covington & Burling, who is serving as counsel to our Committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. MATHIS,
Chairman.

MEMORANDUM RE LEGAL INVALIDITY OF PROPOSED HEARINGS ON AN INTERNATIONAL ANTIDUMPING CODE, JULY 21, 1966

On July 15, 1966 the office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations announced that hearings have been scheduled for September 12, 1966 to receive comment by United States industry, labor and other members of the public on the negotiation of an international antidumping code. These negotiations have already been started by the United States representatives at the current Kennedy Round of trade negotiations in Geneva under the auspices of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs.

This memorandum analyzes the legal authority for holding such hearings or for conducting such negotiations. It concludes first that there is no legal authority for the negotiation of an international antidumping code under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and such negotiations are in clear defiance of a resolution recently passed by the United States Senate. It concludes second that even assuming there were legal authority for the negotiation of an international antidumping code under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, there has been a total failure to comply with the requirements of the Act. It concludes third that in any event, the proposed hearings will be meaningless because no draft code or frame of reference has been provided on which comments or constructive criticism could be made.

1. There is no legal authority for the negotiations of an International Antidumping Code. The authority of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, which announced the public hearings on an international antidumping code, derives solely from the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Under that Act, the President and his representatives were given authority to negotiate trade agreements concerning "existing duties or other import restrictions." The Act makes it clear that this authority concerns only tariff duties or other import restrictions (such as quotas) relating to specific articles of merchandise. There is no authority to negotiate trade agreements with respect to non-tariff legislation, such as the Antidumping Act of 1921, which is not a tariff act and which does not relate to specific articles of merchandise.

The Antidumping Act is an integral part of the unfair trade laws of the United States. It is not designed to impose tariff duties upon specific articles of merchandise but rather to prevent unfair price discrimination by foreign sellers in their exports to the United States. As early as 1916 the Congress of the United States recognized that the "dumping" of goods in this market was an unfair trade practice, and made the practice punishable by criminal penalties and the subject of civil treble damage actions. 15 U.S.C. § 72.

The United States Senate has recently reaffirmed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 100 that there is no authority in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 for any negotiations concerning antidumping. The Resolution states it is the sense of the Congress that no trade agreement or other arrangement under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 should be entered into except in accordance with legislative authority delegated by Congress. The report filed by the Senate Finance Committee, recommending passage of the Resolution, concluded as follows:

"The Committee on Finance has been disturbed over reports that the current Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations may be broadened to include U.S. offers of concessions with respect to matters for which there is no existing delegated authority. . . .

"It has been reported that one area in which our negotiators may offer concessions concerns the American selling price method of evaluation. . . .

"Another area may involve the treatment of 'dumped' goods by the country in which the dumping occurs. This problem concerns unfair trade practices in a domestic economy and it is difficult for us to understand why Congress should be bypassed at the crucial policymaking stages, and permitted to participate only after policy has been frozen in an international trade agreement."

It is thus clear that the negotiation of an international dumping code would be without legal authority and in clear defiance of the Senate Resolution. An international antidumping code would require revisions or amendments in the Antidumping Act of 1921, and this can be legally accomplished only by the Congress. This raises the alarming prospect that concessions will be made concerning an unfair trade law vital to the protection of United States industry without the prior deliberation and consent of the Congress as to whether such negotiations should be undertaken.

2. The proposed negotiation of an International Antidumping Code fails to comply with the requirements of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Even assuming that it conceivably could be concluded that authority to negotiate an international antidumping code is provided by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, there has been a total failure to comply with the requirements of the Act.

Section 221 of the Act requires the President to publish and furnish the Tariff Commission with lists of articles which may be the subject of any proposed trade agreement. Within six months after receipt of such a list, the Tariff Commission is required to advise the President with respect to the probable economic effect of the proposed trade agreement. There has been submitted to the Tariff Commission no list or directive which directs the Tariff Commission to advise the President as to the probable economic effect of an international antidumping code modifying the Antidumping Act of 1921. Hence, there has been no compliance with this mandatory requirement of the Act.

Section 221 of the Act also requires the Tariff Commission to advise the President on the probably economic effect on domestic industries of modifications of tariff duties or other import restrictions on specific articles. The Tariff Commission has not done this with respect to any change in the Antidumping Act of 1921. To do so, the Commission would have the impossible task of advising on the probable economic effect on practically every industry in the United States since antidumping duties can be assessed on all articles of merchandise entering this country as long as the unfair trade practices which the Act encompasses are alleged and proved in a fair and open hearing.

The language of Section 221 clearly does not contemplate trade agreements concerning antidumping, and in any case its terms have not been complied with. Any antidumping code resulting from the negotiations would hence be illegal.

3. No frame of reference has been provided which would permit meaningful comments or dialog on a proposed International Antidumping Code. The stated purpose of the hearings announced for September is to elicit from American industry, labor and other members of the public their opinions on an international antidumping code. The U.S. negotiators at the Kennedy Round have already begun such discussions with representatives from the other member countries of GATT. Thus, any opinions expressed in the September hearing would only come well after negotiations and discussion have already begun.

With such discussions having already begun, at the very least the Special Representative's Office should have provided those interested in testifying at the September hearings with the current draft of such an international antidumping code or with an identification of those antidumping standards or procedures whose modification is being considered. Lacking either of these, domestic interests will have no frame of reference which would permit any meaningful comment or constructive criticism. Under these circumstances the hearing can hardly be more than an attempt to appease the Senate and others who have criticized the Special Representative's attempt to interject into the Kennedy Round negotiations a subject which is clearly beyond this authority.

COVINGTON & BURLING,
Counsel To Cement Industry Committee For Tariff and Antidumping.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1966.

Mr. JOHN MATHIS,
Chairman, Cement Industry Committee for Tariff and Antidumping, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: In Governor Herter's absence, thank you for your recent letters and telegram concerning the possibility of negotiations on an international antidumping agreement and the hearing called by the Trade Information Committee (TIC) on this issue.

In your letter of July 21, 1966, following your telegram of that date, you enclosed a memorandum which raises a number of questions regarding the President's authority to enter into negotiations on an international antidumping agreement through the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

I am enclosing for your consideration a response prepared by the General Counsel of this Office. In substance, this response concludes that the President has clear authority to enter into antidumping negotiations through the Special Representative, that the procedural requirements of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 are inapplicable to such a negotiation, and that the TIC hearing is legally valid by Executive Order.

Aside from such legal considerations, I should like to emphasize the following five points—about which there has been some confusion lately:

1. To date in Geneva the United States has been engaged in purely exploratory discussions of the issues involved in dealing with dumping. Neither the United States nor any other country has taken a formal position on any issue.

2. The GATT Secretariat is currently preparing a paper which will draw upon these discussions and outline under appropriate headings the possible elements of an antidumping agreement. This paper is designed to facilitate consideration by the countries concerned of the possibility of negotiating such an agreement and by their unanimous decision will in no sense represent a draft agreement.

3. The TIC hearing has been called for the explicit purpose of soliciting the views of interested persons regarding any possible antidumping agreement. The notice of this hearing identifies all of the basic areas which would have to be dealt with in negotiating such an agreement.

4. No formal position will be taken by the United States on any issue relating to a possible antidumping agreement until after the views expressed at the TIC hearing have been fully considered and approval has been given by the President.

5. Any antidumping agreement would be evaluated on the basis of its intrinsic merits and would be concluded separately from the overall Kennedy Round agreement.

I should add that the TIC hearing is, in our judgment, fully responsive to your request in your letter of July 6, 1966, for an opportunity to be heard and to give us the benefit of your experience and counsel regarding antidumping. Moreover, I assure

you that we are available at any time to meet with you and other members of your Committee to discuss any issue relating to the possibility of negotiating an international antidumping agreement.

I am taking the liberty of sending copies of this letter, together with its enclosure, to our Congressional Delegates as well as to other members of the Congress who have requested our comments on the memorandum enclosed in your letter of July 21, 1966.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. ROTH,
Acting Special Representative.

MEMORANDUM FROM OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS, AUGUST 17, 1966

This memorandum is in response to a memorandum, dated July 21, 1966, prepared by counsel to the Cement Industry Committee for Tariff and Antidumping. The Cement Industry Committee memorandum raises a number of questions regarding the President's authority to enter into international negotiations on antidumping, through the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

BACKGROUND

During the past several months, as part of the general discussions on non-tariff barriers in the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations, discussions have been taking place in Geneva regarding Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the content and administration of national antidumping laws. Other countries have criticized aspects of the U.S. antidumping law. The United States, in turn, has pointed to difficulties encountered by U.S. exporters in the application of foreign antidumping laws, and has expressed concern that such laws will increasingly be used as unjustifiable non-tariff barriers to trade. As a consequence of these discussions, the United States and the other countries concerned have indicated interest in a possible international antidumping agreement, which would elaborate and perhaps alter the present provisions of Article VI of the GATT. To assist the United States in preparing its position on this question, public hearings have been set for September 12, 1966 by the Trade Information Committee (TIC) in the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

After consideration of the questions raised in the Cement Industry Committee memorandum, we have reached the following conclusions:

1. The President has clear Constitutional authority to enter into negotiations looking toward a possible international agreement on antidumping.

2. Both as a matter of Constitutional law, and under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (TEA), it is clear that the President may authorize the Special Representative to enter into negotiations on an international antidumping agreement.

3. If any international antidumping agreement is concluded which envisions amendments to the U.S. Antidumping Act of 1921, the President would have to seek legislation from the Congress. The President has no statutory authority to amend the 1921 Antidumping Act pursuant to a trade agreement. Consequently the procedural requirements of sections 221–224 of the TEA, including publication of lists of articles whose duties may be reduced in trade agreements and Tariff Commission hearings and advice, are inapplicable.

4. Because it is not clear that any international agreement would entail amendments to the 1921 Antidumping Act, the concerns expressed in the Senate Finance Committee report accompanying S. Con. Res. 100 are not wholly opposite and, in any case, would be fully met in the conduct of any negotiations.

5. The public hearing of the Trade Information Committee (TIC) is clearly legal, being expressly authorized by Executive Order.

6. The Trade Information Committee (TIC) hearings will serve a useful function by providing a forum in which interested parties can present their views on antidumping so that those views may be taken into account if any international antidumping agreement is negotiated.

DISCUSSION

1. Under the Constitution, the President has the authority to conduct foreign relations. It is clear that the President may exercise this authority to enter into agreements with foreign nations, such as an international antidumping agreement. The Cement Industry Committee memorandum does not appear to question the existence of this clear Constitutional authority.

Moreover, the President has expressly given to the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations the responsibility not only of advising him with respect to non-tariff barriers but also of assisting him in the negotiation of trade agreements which rest upon his Constitutional authority. This the President has done by sections 3(b) and 1(b) of Executive Order No. 11075, as amended (48 CFR 1.3(b) and 1.1(b)).

2. The Cement Industry Committee memorandum states that the "authority of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations . . . derives solely from the Trade Expansion Act of 1962," and that this Act gives the President authority only to "negotiate trade agreements concerning 'existing duties or other import restrictions'" but gives no negotiating authority regarding a non-tariff trade issue such an antidumping. From this premise, the memorandum argues that the Special Representative cannot enter into negotiations, at the direction of the President, on a possible international agreement on antidumping. This argument is incorrect.

The TEA in no way restricts the President from exercising his Constitutional prerogative to enter into negotiations with foreign countries regarding any subject affecting international trade. Nor does the TEA restrict the functions which the President may delegate to the Special Representative regarding such negotiations. Indeed, section 241(a) of the TEA (19 U.S.C. 1871(a)) explicitly provides that the Special Representative shall be the chief representative of the United States for negotiations under the TEA "and for such other negotiations as in the President's judgment require that the Special Representative be the chief representative of the United States."

Moreover, in the exercise of his Constitutional authority to conduct foreign relations, the President must necessarily be free to secure assistance from any source he chooses. Pursuant to this authority, section 3(a) of Executive Order 11075, as amended, (48 CFR 1.3(a)), provides that the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations shall have such functions as the President may direct from time to time, in addition to those functions conferred by the TEA and the Executive Order.

Thus, as a matter of both Constitutional and statutory law, it is clear that the President may authorize the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations to negotiate an antidumping agreement.

3. Under the TEA, the President is authorized to modify "duties and other import restrictions" pursuant to trade agreements. In our judgment, this authority does not permit the President to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, pursuant to a trade agreement. If the President entered into an international agreement which envisioned amendments to the 1921 Act, only Congress could enact such amendments. (If an international agreement was limited to changes which did not require amendment of the 1921 Act, the Executive could implement the agreement without Congressional action.)

The Cement Industry Committee memorandum states that consideration of an international antidumping agreement must be preceded, under section 221 of the TEA, by "publication of lists of articles which may be the subject of any proposed trade agreements" and Tariff Commission hearings and advice to the President. This argument is incorrect.

The prenegotiation requirements of section 221 of the TEA apply regarding "articles which may be considered for modification or continuance of United States duties or other import restrictions . . ." As noted above, the Presidential authority to alter "duties or other import restrictions" pursuant to a trade agreement does not apply to the Antidumping Act of 1921. Since this authority does not apply to the Antidumping Act, the statutory prenegotiation requirements in section 221 of the TEA also do not apply.

4. The Cement Industry Committee memorandum states that "the negotiation of an international antidumping code would be . . . in clear defiance" of Senate Concurrent Resolution 100. This Concurrent Resolution (which has not been passed by the House of Representatives and is therefore not in effect) expresses the sense of Congress that the President should only enter into trade agreements in the Kennedy Round which would not require subsequent Congressional implementation. With regard to an antidumping agreement, the Senate Finance Committee Report notes concern that Congress would "be bypassed at the crucial policymaking stages, and permitted to participate only after policy has been frozen in an international trade agreement."

Further consideration by the Executive Branch of the possibility of an international antidumping agreement, including the TIC hearing, would not be "in clear defiance" of this Senate Concurrent Resolution. It is clear that an international agreement may be concluded which would not require changes in the 1921 Antidumping Act, and such an agreement would not involve the policymaking functions of the Congress.

If, however, any agreement envisioning changes in the 1921 Antidumping Act were concluded, the interests of the Congress would be respected and the concerns expressed in the Senate Finance Committee report would be met. First, the Congress would be kept fully informed at every step of any antidumping negotiation—indeed, whether or not Congressional action would be required. The September 12 TIC hearing will inform the Congress, as well as the Executive, regarding the views of interested persons. Moreover, the Congressional Delegates to the Kennedy Round would be able to observe the conduct of any negotiation in Geneva. Second, if any agreement were in fact concluded envisioning changes in the 1921 Act, the Congress would be free to accept or reject any proposed amendment to the 1921 Act based on its evaluation of the intrinsic merits of any such antidumping agreement. Any antidumping agreement will be concluded in an agreement separate from the overall results of the Kennedy Round, which Congress could accept or reject without affecting the overall Kennedy Round agreement.

5. The Cement Industry Committee memorandum asserts, without elaboration, that the proposed hearing of the TIC is legally invalid. This assertion is incorrect.

As noted above, by Executive Order No. 11075, as amended, the President has given to the Special Representative the responsibility of advising him with respect to nontariff barriers and of assisting him in all activities related to the negotiation of trade agreements which rest upon his Constitutional authority. In discharging this responsibility, section 3(c) of this Order (48 CFR 1.3(c)) provides that the Special Representative shall, as he may deem to be necessary, draw upon the resources of bodies established by or under the provisions of the same Order. These bodies include the TIC. In addition, a TIC hearing concerning the possible negotiation of an antidumping agreement is clearly envisaged by section 3(b)(3) of Directive No. 1 (48 CFR 202.3(b)(3)), which established the TIC, and by section 2(d) itself of the TIC regulations (48 CFR 211.2(d)).

6. The Cement Industry Committee memorandum states, in effect, that "negotiations have already begun" and therefore interested persons will not be able to make meaningful comments at the TIC hearing unless they are provided "with the current draft of an international antidumping code or with an identification of those antidumping standards or procedures whose modification is being considered".

First, no negotiations on an antidumping agreement have taken place. The meetings to date in Geneva have been devoted only to exploratory discussions of substantive and procedural issues involved in dealing with dumping. These discussions have in no way committed the United States or any other country to any position on any possible provision of an antidumping agreement. Indeed, no formal position will be taken by the United States on any issue until after the views expressed at the TIC hearing have been fully considered within the Executive Branch and approval has been given by the President.

Second, there is no document in existence which is regarded by the participating countries as the draft of an antidumping agreement. The papers submitted by many countries, which have been the subject of the discussions in Geneva, were tentative and exploratory. In the light of these discussions, the GATT Secretariat is currently preparing a paper which will outline under appropriate headings the possible elements of an antidumping agreement. This latter paper is intended to facilitate consideration by the participating countries of the possibility of negotiating such an agreement. It has been expressly agreed by all that this paper would in no sense represent a draft agreement. It should be noted that, under GATT procedures, none of these papers is available for public circulation.

Third, we believe that the terms of the notice of the TIC hearing do provide an adequate frame of reference for meaningful contributions by interested persons. Paragraphs (i)–(v) of section 2 of the TIC notice (31 F.R. 9619—July 15, 1966) identify all of the basic areas which have been dealt with to date in the discussions in Geneva. In addition, these paragraphs set out some of the major subsidiary questions which must be dealt with in considering a possible antidumping agreement and which may lead to a modification of existing antidumping standards or procedures. Moreover, section 8 of the TIC notice expressly provides that additional information regarding the coverage of the hearing may be requested from the TIC. Finally, the staff of this Office is available to meet at any time with interested persons to discuss the issues which will be the subject of any possible negotiation of an antidumping agreement.

CEMENT INDUSTRY COMMITTEE ON TARIFF AND ANTIDUMPING, 1966

Allentown Portland Cement Co.
Alpha Portland Cement Co.
American Cement Corp.
Ash Grove Lime & Portland Cement Co.
Atlantic Cement Co., Inc.
California Portland Cement Co.
Columbia Cement Corp.
Coplay Cement Manufacturing Co.
Diamond Alkali Co.
The Flintkote Co.
General Portland Cement Co.
Giant Portland Cement Co.
Gulf Coast Portland Cement Co.
Huron Portland Cement Co.
Ideal Cement Co.
Kaiser Cement & Gypsum Co.
Keystone Portland Cement Co.
Lehigh Portland Cement Co.
Lone Star Cement Corp.
Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co.
Martin Marietta Corp.
Medusa Portland Cement Co.
Missouri Portland Cement Co.
National Cement Co.
National Portland Cement Co.
Nazareth Cement Co.
Northwestern States Portland Cement Co.
Oklahoma Cement Co.
Oregon Portland Cement Co.
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp.
Puerto Rican Cement Co., Inc.
San Antonio Portland Cement Co.
Southwestern Portland Cement Co.
Whitehall Cement Manufacturing Co.
Wyandotte Chemicals Corp.

ADVICE AND DISSENT

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] 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. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the soaring prices under the Johnson-Humphrey Democratic administration have become a serious matter for millions of our people. We cannot dismiss this problem with the "slip, slide, and duck" technique recommended by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman. An editorial in the Detroit News for August 17, 1966, entitled "Advice and Dissent," emphasizes that current high prices deserve greater and more sincere consideration by Mr. Johnson and his administration.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial:

ADVICE AND DISSENT

If a "Politician's Almanac" is ever written, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman should be assigned to write the chapter on consumer prices. The secretary has given some fascinating advice on the subject to Democratic congressional candidates:

"Slip, slide and duck any question of higher consumer prices if you possibly can. Don't get caught in a debate over higher prices between housewives and farmers. If you do, and have to choose a side take the farmer's side. It's the right side and, besides, housewives aren't nearly so well organized."

Freeman practices what he preaches. He is an excellent "slip, slide and duck" man. He has called on the Federal Trade Commission to investigate soaring food prices in order to keep his own department out of the cross-fire. Freeman has also prejudged the investigation by blaming the middleman for rising prices and, of course, this is good politics because middlemen are not very well organized either.

But Freeman may be in for a jolt if housewives remember that "organization" is not necessary in a voting booth. Congressmen who follow Freeman's slippery tactics can be voted out of office with a mere flip of a lever. When politicians try to make political hay out of the housewives' soaring food budget, they deserve no better fate.

VIETCONG IN CAMBODIA

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] 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. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, a little over a week ago a self-appointed group calling itself "Americans Want To Know" returned from a tour conducted by the Cambodian Government of areas bordering on South Vietnam. To no one's surprise the group found no evidence of Vietcong or North Vietnamese units in Cambodia. Many have taken the same guided tour with the same results in the past. Unlike this particular group, some others have been genuinely concerned enough to check the situation from the other side of the border by asking the troops who are doing the fighting.

A columnist who has recently examined the evidence, Richard Fryklund, has joined a growing group of journalists who are convinced that Cambodia is being used by the Vietcong irrespective of the diplomatic protests of that country as to its "strict neutrality." In an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star, August 23, Mr. Fryklund writes:

Despite State Department and Pentagon efforts to question the existence of Viet Cong and North Vietnamese bases in Cambodia, the evidence is overwhelming.

They are there. They are immensely valuable to the enemy. The only question remaining is what to do about them. The evidence of the use of Cambodia has come from all of the traditional and a few new means of intelligence. But any visitor to South Viet Nam can find his own evidence. He can question prisoners of war at great length, listen to their descriptions of their movements in and out of Cambodia and decide for himself whether the men know where they have been and what they have done. This reporter has checked on the scene and is convinced that the intelligence reports are accurate.

I will include the entire article entitled "Cambodian Sanctuary Prolongs War," in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the handling of the Cambodian situation may very well hold the key to the success of our efforts in South Vietnam. It is becoming increasingly clear to everyone that until the Cambodian border is sealed, the Vietcong can carry on the war indefinitely.

To date the efforts of the administration with regard to Cambodia have been

clearly ineffective. Official tolerance of use of Cambodian soil by the Vietcong has done nothing to end the Cambodian Government's courtship of Communist China, North Vietnam, and the National Liberation Front. The great optimism that Prince Sihanouk was at last ready to take some real steps toward tighter border surveillance now appears to have been a false hope. Sihanouk continues to act on the assumption that the Vietcong will ultimately win, and we continue to stand ineffectually by and officially pretend to believe in Cambodian neutrality while at the same time finding it necessary to send hundreds of thousands of American boys to fight for South Vietnam's freedom.

The situation cannot be permitted to drift. The Vietcong's back-door source of supply must be closed and it is time the administration faced up to it.

The complete article follows:

CAMBODIA SANCTUARY PROLONGS WAR

(By Richard Fryklund)

There can be no doubt now that Cambodia is being used as a privileged sanctuary by the Communist armies and that continued use of the rest and resupply areas there puts a heavy handicap on allied forces fighting in South Viet Nam.

Despite State Department and Pentagon efforts to question the existence of Viet Cong and North Vietnamese bases in Cambodia, the evidence is overwhelming.

They are there. They are immensely valuable to the enemy. The only question remaining is what to do about them.

The evidence of the use of Cambodia has come from all of the traditional and a few new means of intelligence. But any visitor to South Viet Nam can find his own evidence.

He can question prisoners of war at great length, listen to their descriptions of their movements in and out of Cambodia and decide for himself whether the men know where they have been and what they have done.

This reporter has checked on the scene and is convinced that the intelligence reports are accurate.

The military men in South Viet Nam may not know on a precise day which enemy units are infiltrating through Cambodia or resting and being resupplied in the primitive jungle camps there, but they do know that they cannot corner an enemy who keeps his back to the border and slips across, sometimes on rocket signal from outside Cambodia, when the going gets too hot.

The sanctuary is prolonging the war. If the guerrilla war is won eventually without closing the border, this well be the first such success in the recent history of counter-insurgency.

But how to close it?

There are many proposals, some efforts and no progress.

The State Department is trying to get the Cambodian ruler, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, to close his own borders or cooperate in a joint effort. He does not concede that the Communists side uses his territory for infiltration or as a sanctuary, but he has said that he will cooperate with the International Control Commission that probably could supervise the border under terms of the 1954 Geneva Convention.

But one of the ICC members is Poland, and Poland will not permit a border check.

There are suggestions in Washington that the United Nations do the job, financed by the United States; but there are some hazards, in the U.S. government view, in introducing the United Nations and its vetoes and neutralists and Communists into this struggle.

So military leaders in South Viet Nam and Washington are looking for ways to seal the border by force—or at least to reduce the movement back and forth.

Allied land and air forces are trying now to find and destroy large enemy units in the border area.

But it's a long border, wooded through most of its length, and enemy soldiers have plenty of trails and waterways to choose from. Operations by scores of thousands of allied soldiers probably have forced the enemy to work harder, but they haven't slowed him down.

Some military men in Viet Nam would like to extend their operations across the border.

From a simple military point of view, without consideration of diplomatic complications, it would be logical to harass and destroy in the storage and trail areas of Cambodia.

The allies might sow mine fields; they might put outposts in the Cambodian jungle.

But these efforts still would not stop the movement.

So there are many proposals also to seal the border.

France put fences and mine fields along much of the Algerian border in the late 1950's, and that proved to be fairly effective in containing a war that was hopeless anyhow.

Some American officers would like to try this along the Cambodian border.

They would start in the areas where the infiltration is the greatest, say in the Ia Drang River Valley near Pleiku.

First they would get rid of the trees in a strip several hundreds yards wide. Present defoliating chemicals take the leaves off the trees and kill most of them, but they do not hold the lush jungle undergrowth in check for long. So better chemicals are needed.

Or modern "tree-crusher" machinery could grind up the forest.

The clearing job would be a vast one, but some military leaders point out that huge construction jobs can be completed in Asia with the slow application of massive manpower.

The cleared area could be fenced, mined, patrolled and watched by various electronic, infra-red and acoustic devices.

However difficult the job, it does not seem nearly as slow or as tiring as the job of finding all the enemy soldiers who use the sanctuary.

ATTACK OF THE TAIL-FIN PEOPLE

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] 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. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the August 15th issue of NAM Reports has been brought to my attention. Since this article is concerned with the so-called truth-in-packaging bill which is presently under consideration in our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I include it in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

ATTACK OF THE TAIL-FIN PEOPLE—OR, AFTER THE HART BILL, WHAT?

(NOTE.—A few years ago, the tail fins on cars, like the dachshunds in World War I, became targets of inexplicable attacks by anti-industry groups. Some of the same people, with new allies, today are just as upset by a package that says "giant size," or a sticker that says "10 Cents Off." Here is explored the question of what such peole will be upset about tomorrow, and what they may do about it that will affect American industry.)

Anyone who markets anything and fails to concern himself about the progress of the Hart Packaging and Labeling Bill through the House must be unaware of the nature of the pressures for consumer legislation of all kinds.

When Senator HART (D., Mich.) resisted addition of other commodities to the ones covered by his bill, he made perfectly plain that he favored such legislation—but in additional bills. The Senate passed the bill, leaving other commodities for later.

This was wise strategy on the part of the supporters of consumer legislation. If all the regulation they favor had been wrapped in a single package and honestly labeled all businessmen would have been alarmed into action.

The food and grocery products manufacturers, alone, have considerable resources, and have deployed them well in their effort to defend their marketing freedom. Hart Bill supporters are confident that the food industry, alone, can't defeat the bill. After all, in the Senate they were proved right.

If the Hart Bill (H.R. 15440) passes, then, the food industry may be expected to be on the sidelines when the next regulatory bill comes along, and the divide and conquer tactics will have worked. The strategy of the consumerists evidently is never to engage all industries at one time.

If the Truth in Lending Bill should come up next, in the present Congress or the impending one, the food companies will have no direct interest (who buys oleo on time?) and the consumerists will again be facing with their entire force only a fragment of the resources that all industry and business are capable of putting into the field.

A swift survey of consumer protection proposals now in varying stages of incubation should convince nearly anyone that additional regulation is certain for every industry if the Hart Bill gives the consumerists the start they need. From then on, industry will be faced with such proposals as:

1. Truth in Lending (S. 2275)—a bill by Sen. DOUGLAS of Illinois. This one could adversely affect every company whose products are sold on credit at retail, regardless of who extends the credit. The bill offers no way in which credit may be made less expensive, and actually might tend to frighten consumers away from credit by pinning a warning label on it as the Government has finally succeeded in doing with cigarettes. (Sales are up since.)

A customer could conceivably boggle at learning that he will pay an effective "interest rate" of 11½ percent by charging an air conditioner he can't now pay cash for. But whether he will, in fact, choose to swelter through a summer rather than pay all the costs that someone must meet if credit sales are to be arranged is a matter that only he is prepared to answer.

He may, with some consumerists, feel that six percent is somehow a maximum moral figure, whether it covers the expenses of credit checks, paperwork and the company's own interest payments, and refuse to buy. Or, he may be bright enough to say that 5½ percent of $200 is $11, or a few cents a day for beating the heat all summer, and please deliver as soon as possible. It costs more to rent an air conditioner.

The Douglas Bill could affect sales, but certainly it will add to the cost of extending credit by adding clerical and paperwork and printing.

2. Grade labeling: This veteran proposal has been resurrected by the Food Marketing Commission.

Its companion in kind is the proposal to force physicians to write prescriptions in generic, rather than in brand, terms. (Excuse for the latter, of course, is that the

Government now pays for some prescriptions under Medicare, and earlier assurances that Medicare would not affect the practice of the doctor are already forgotten.)

3. Design standards: The auto safety bill (H.R. 13228) is an example of this, but once this one passes consumerists will be encouraged to remove the designing of additional products from the engineering departments of companies to the committees of Congress and the staffs of the regulatory agencies and Federal departments.

4. Publicized comparisons of products on the market: One official has suggested that the Government subsidize such outfits as Consumer Reports and Consumers Union in their product tests, and broadcast the outcomes.

Another suggestion is that the Government's purchasing agents be required to make publicly available the results of their studies for purposes of making Federal purchases.

Perhaps one needn't concern the grocery items producers much, because it would work like this: The housewife draws up a list of 35 or 40 grocery items. First is, say, canned peaches. So, she goes to the public library and reads through the technical data on the hundred or five hundred brands of canned peaches that are offered in the U. S., plus the sublistings for halves and slices, and the packs in heavy syrup and dietary mixtures, cling and freestone, Elberta and other varieties. Fine, this is the one (if the store has it.) Now for the canned tomatoes. And so on. By the time she gets to the store, it is closed.

But what about consumer durables?

The private consumer testing outfits do some meticulous tests, and adulterate their reports with all sorts of subjective comments. One or two units of a product run in hundreds of thousands are tested, if the items are expensive, and a squeak in one unit could be amplified so it could be heard around the nation. Often the most important features of a product (like the sound of a radio) must be judged subjectively, and are. The panels are relatively small, and the opinions seldom unanimous. But tiny differences from unit to unit, slight edges in panel approval and such could give disproportionate boosts to the products of some firms and spell disaster to others, once such mixtures of test and opinion bore the Federal cachet.

Then, with millions at stake, the temptation to bribery would be present, and the suspicion of bribery pervasive.

The findings of Federal purchasers would be largely irrelevant to the needs of the consumer. The purchasing agent, convinced an office chair will last 50 years without maintenance and is low priced, is satisfied. He doesn't have to sit in it.

His taste standards, likely, will run to Rayburn Building neo-classic, and he will seldom make an error in calculating costs larger than was made in estimating that building—say 100 percent.

5. Limitations on advertising: When the Federal Government wants to enlist the public in the interest of Savings Bonds, beautification, employment of the handicapped or prevention of forest fires, it garners free space in all the media and free service from all the advertising agencies. But many in the Capital are on record as feeling that any other advertising is, somehow, evil.

Assistant Attorney General Donald F. Turner has proposed that the advertising expenditures of large companies be controlled as a novel anti-trust measure to prevent concentration.

His support from the consumerists, who would prefer to do away with all advertising, will be strong.

This is a matter of concern, of course, to the largest companies, who would be directly affected.

It is also a direct threat to every TV and radio station, every newspaper, every magazine, every outdoor advertising company, every printer and every direct mail house.

It is, consequently, a threat to our entire expensive and intricate system of gathering and disseminating information independent of Government sources and subsidies, known collectively as the "free press," and now including the broadcast media.

6. Regulation of volume discounts of advertising media: This is an idea that would raise costs to every regular, substantial user of advertising space and time, and consequently raise costs to consumers, or it would reduce the use of advertising, and raise cain with the media and with sales.

7. Federal sponsorship of consumer education classes in the public schools: The NAM and other businesses and business organizations have no objection to consumer education, as such. Woe to business in general if its success ever depended upon ignorance. In such a case, all research and development to improve consumer products would be sheer waste.

The danger of this proposal is that its administration surely would wind up in the hands of the consumerists, whose mistrust of business is notorious.

It might be that such classes would *not* recommend bulk cracked wheat as less expensive and just as nutritious as wheat cereal pre-sweetened and made in the shape of kangaroos, but would you want to bet? And the young homemakers who follow such advice are, take it from the father of a 3-year-old, going to have woes inducing consumption of such chicken feed by willful toddlers.

Such classes are nearly certain to reflect the consumerists' strange set of values that people are more important than money, but nothing is more important to people in what they buy than money. The theme song can hardly be other than "cents per ounce, and forget the differences."

As our Government consumerists presently are oriented, we may reasonably expect the classes to bear some resemblance to the "make your wedding dress out of flour sacks" approach recalled from the Federal advisories to consumers in the 1930's.

Austerity is traditionally the keynote in such classes—a hair shirt lasts longer than a cotton one. Best Buy.

8. A "Hart Bill" for consumer durables: This will require legislative ingenuity and will lead to an administrative monstrosity, but a full wave of consumerism must lead here. If, as some lawmakers now contend, your wife is hopelessly baffled choosing between two boxes of corn flakes, can the Government, from which all blessings flow, fail her when she must choose between two electric floor polishers, which last longer than corn flakes in most cases, and which make a bigger dent in the family budget? No, customer "confusion" was the reason for the Hart Bill, and Steinmetz might have been confused by the wealth of competing virtues and features offered by today's manufacturers of hard goods.

So any Hart approach to consumer durables probably would have to take the same line as the Hart Bill on packaged goods. You can eliminate the confusion by eliminating the choices.

9. Federal supervision of warranties and guarantees: This would simply make a Federal case out of each dissatisfied customer. Today, the manufacturer's interest in such a customer is in making an adjustment that will keep the customer. The new approach would make the manufacturer and the customer adversaries before a third party, and likely dash any such hope. The customer, then, could expect less interest—because the manufacturer's attention would be centered on getting Uncle Sam rather than the customer calmed down.

10. Licensing: NAM has had two reports from separate sources that the White House is actively seeking a workable plan for the Federal licensing of businesses in the interest of assuring consumer satisfaction. The licenses would be suspendable and revokable, and are intended to be designed for deterrent effect like atomic bombs.

Where is the support for such measures?

Labor unions and credit unions long have had consumer programs, although not necessarily pro-regulation, anti-business programs. A few individuals had made precarious livings as executives of "consumer" organizations. There were some consumer magazines, which evaluated products for audiences of college instructors and ladies with no make-up.

When politics discovered the consumer—whom Congress had been representing all along under the impression they were constituents—these venerable institutions were shaken up by unwonted attentions, the calling of conferences coast-to-coast, the appointment of commissions and committees and groups and panels and boards, all with mandates to forget the roses and search for thorns.

Business, which had habitually kept prices down through competition and development of new manufacturing and marketing methods, was accused of rifling the customer's pocketbooks, and Government, which had for years boosted prices with farm programs, commodity stabilization agreements abroad, excise and other taxes, minimum wage laws, etc., was quickly sketched in as the guardian of the purchaser's pennies.

A public, concerned with its own affairs and larger issues like Viet Nam and inflation, learns of a "bill to help consumers," and pays little note, save to be flattered by the attention and hopeful that results may be good.

Backing the consumerists now are the White House (with Esther Peterson as Presidential Advisor on Consumer Affairs and a full-blown, report-issuing "Consumer's Advisory Council"; the majority of the Food Marketing Commission, majorities of the Democratic majorities in both houses, minorities of the Republican minorities in both houses, a host of organizations that have been set up with Office of Economic Opportunity cash, some academicians, some anti-trusters, a horde of Federal employees in regulatory agencies that are already years behind on their cases, and a dear lady in our block whose Chalmers Touring Car once developed a crack in the ising glass after dealer had gone out of business.

Broad-scale public support is not in evidence.

But the strength to pass the bills is enough, provided businesses and industries can be picked off, one by one, each unaware of the general trend and not even bothering to send to ask for whom the bell tolls.

Observers feel that any businessman who thinks he is not affected by the Hart Bill cannot be fully aware of what a Hart Bill success would release upon other industries. And, in these days diversification may lead any business into an area covered by the Packaging and Labeling bill, anyway.

They feel that this bill, now pending in the House, is the foundation upon which a vast regulatory structure will be based, and that it will be nearly impossible to stop the construction once the foundation is in place.

TO PERMIT TEACHERS TO DEDUCT EDUCATION EXPENSE FROM FEDERAL TAXES

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] 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. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill amending the Internal Revenue Code to permit teachers to deduct the expense of their own education from Federal taxes.

Excellence in education is of paramount importance to our children and to the future welfare of our country. The purpose of my bill is to offer our teachers an incentive to continue to upgrade their own abilities and thereby improve the quality of education generally.

A teacher's pay is often dependent upon his or her educational attainment. Students, parents and the whole Nation benefit by encouraging teachers to improve themselves by keeping up with the latest and most modern techniques while at the same time giving our dedicated educators an opportunity to increase their own salaries.

Businessmen are allowed tax deductions for legitimate expenses relating to their business, and it seems only fair that teachers be given similar treatment under the law.

The greatest investment our Nation can make is to provide our youth with the best possible education, and tax help for teachers would be a giant step forward.

LEGISLATION TO CURB ANTIWAR ACTIVITIES

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] 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. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, it should be perfectly obvious to the Members of this body after a week of hearings before the Un-American Activities Committee that the international Communist movement has successfully infiltrated the antiwar groups in this country. In fact, one could reasonably conclude that these groups are actually dominated by the Communist conspiracy. The committee has heard testimony from avowed Communists who are proud of their role in obstructing and interfering with the movement of men and supplies to South Vietnam.

I have been shocked and appalled by the extent of Communist subversion behind these peace groups which has come to light during these hearings. The witnesses called upon to testify are not simply leftist-oriented idealists seeking a just peace in Vietnam. They are hard-core Communists who advocate the overthrow of this Government by violence or any other means to attain this end. They are just as dangerous to the survival of freedom as a Communist aggressor locked in a life and death struggle with an American soldier at this very moment in Vietnam.

They are actively engaged in attempts to thwart the war effort. This sort of activity is in no way related to the right of American citizens to peacefully dissent from Government activities. They are the perpetrators of organized attempts to block troop movements involving our military personnel. They are burning draft cards and contributing financial support to the Vietcong.

Make no doubts about it, these protesters are giving aid and comfort to the enemy at a time when this Nation is at war. Their actions border on treason, and actually would be treason were we in a declared state of war. It is up to Congress to see that such revolutionary tactics by these anarchists are dealt with by severe penalties under the law.

I urge my colleagues to give overwhelming support to the measure approved by the Un-American Activities Committee today to deal with this critical problem. My friend, the gentleman from Texas, who has so ably conducted these hearings, introduced this legislation which would curb the activities of these "peacenik" groups. His bill would amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 by providing a fine of not more than $10,000 or a prison sentence of not less than 5 years, or both, for persons convicted of obstructing our military effort or giving assistance to enemy forces.

We must not let this Congress adjourn without passing a measure of this type. It is our obligation to American fighting men who are dying to preserve our way of life. It is incredible to me that while our young men are giving their lives for freedom in a faraway land, youth of a comparable age in this country are joining ranks with the forces of oppression. They are indeed plunging the dagger into the backs of our fighting men. Now is the time to deal with these acts of treason. I think a long-term period of incarceration might tend to curtail this seditious activity, and it is up to us to provide such a penalty.

COMBINED GREEK ORTHODOX SERVICES IN TRIBUTE TO WAR DEAD AT CATHEDRAL OF THE PINES, RINDGE, N.H., JULY 10, 1966

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. 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, on Sunday, July 10, I was privileged to participate in a portion of the ceremonies at the Cathedral of the Pines in which the faithful of the Greek Orthodox Church from throughout New England assembled to witness a very special event during the annual combined services at the cathedral.

The beautiful Cathedral of the Pines, in Rindge, in my district, is an international shrine to war dead. It is the site of the Altar of the Nation, which is the only memorial which pays tribute to all of America's war dead.

This special event was the result of a truly responsible attitude within the Greek community of New England. Realizing that many personal sacrifices are being made daily in Vietnam, they wanted to honor the memory of the members of their church who have died in the defense of liberty. And this is very understandable because these sons of Greece in America today have ancestral lines running back to the homeland of Western democracy. The blood that they have now shed is mingled with the blood of earlier heroes who have likewise fallen throughout the centuries of conflict in defense of human liberty.

The ancient Greeks were peace-lovers; so too were these young Americans being honored. The ancient Greeks were men of freedom; so too were these young men. The ancient Greeks were mighty warriors who were not afraid to give their lives for their ideals; so too were these young men. The ancient Greeks loved and worshipped the Creator as the source of all their blessings; so too did these young men. Now they are joined in one company of heroes and the Greek community of New England assembled on this day to be in the spiritual presence of these men.

BISHOP GERASIMOS OFFICIATES

Officiating at this archieratical divine liturgy was His Grace, Bishop Gerasimos of the New England Diocese. He was assisted by various clergy from throughout New England. Liturgical responses were provided by the Byzantine Male Choir of Lowell, led by Dr. Christos J. Bentas.

As part of the memorial services, a large wreath was presented by New England members of the AHEPA, a nationwide fraternal organization of Greek-Americans.

These AHEPA members passed three separate resolutions at three separate conventions of the three districts comprising the New England area. These resolutions made possible the attendance at this event of the three separate district lodges. Leading their respective districts was Attorney Harold Demopoulos, district governor No. 7, James Tzellas, district governor No. 8, and Attorney John Pappas, district governor No. 9. More than 5,000 persons worshipped and prayed at this mountaintop Cathedral of the Pines.

Following the services the Greek community of Keene, N.H., provided an outdoor barbecue for those attending. This barbecue was held on the campus of nearby Franklin Pierce College, which had donated its complete facilities for this occasion.

This day's events truly depicted the tradition of responsibility and cooperation so prevalent in the ancient Greek culture that has now become a significant part of our American society. For just as the ancient Greeks respected honor, liberty, and justice, so too do today's Americans of Greek descent cherish these ideals and use them to guide their everyday conduct. Let us salute the valor of these young men who

have given their lives, and live so as to be worthy of the sacrifices made. Let us also salute the responsible spirit of the Greek community that makes possible events such as those that took place on July 10.

INSTITUTION BUILDING IN THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY—A PACIFIC BANKERS' ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we have entered the era of institution building in the Pacific community. Within the past few years we have seen many institutions begin to take form pulling Pacific neighbors ever closer together. Among the more well known have been the recently formed Asian and Pacific Cooperation Council, the Asian Development Bank, and the Mekong River project. Among the less publicized, but equally significant in their own way, have been such institutions as the Australia-Japan Business Cooperation Committee and the Trans-Tasman Trade Agreement. These are the sure signs, the first light of the dawning of the Pacific era, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad that our President has so astutely recognized this critical, dynamic factor of international relations today.

If I read his momentous speech of July 12, 1966, correctly, the President of the United States has given our foreign policy new luster and new energy to meet the challenges and opportunities that lie in the Pacific. He has said that our policy shall be to encourage, to help cultivate, and to help protect the bright future of a dynamic new Asia that is now blossoming in the western Pacific.

The war, of course, is a great and poignant tragedy as war always is. It is tragic for the Vietnamese people. It is tragic for us and for our President. It is tragic for all men who hope for lasting peace. However, in the recognition of such tragedies let us not be so absorbed by the pall of war that we fail to see that elsewhere in the Pacific community, Asians are on the move, vigorously advancing toward a better life for themselves and a progressive and prosperous future for their children.

Mr. Speaker, the President has set the tone for constructive action in the Pacific. He has created an enlivened environment for positive thinking about the Pacific community. But setting the environment, as our President well knows, is not enough. A community does not spring forth whole, as Minerva did from the head of Zeus, merely because of the environment. It must be built by hard work, one brick at a time and, Mr. Speaker, institutions are the bricks of any community.

It has been long evident to the students of society and its governments that you must build institutions to bring together a people and enable them to have a common consort in their activities. In the process of building a community, institutions have always been both the seed and the catalyst, essential ingredients with which societies, working toward common goals, may develop a harmonious working relationship.

We conclude that it is helpful but not sufficient for an institution to begin at the topmost level. Institutions which begin at the very top, such as the United Nations and its subsidiary, the Commission for Asia and the Far East—ECAFE—fulfill a crucial function in the diplomacy of a changing and shrinking world. They provide a necessary framework for coordinating and setting general guidelines on international political harmony. Within that framework they are starting work on solving some of this world's critical problems: economic development, world hunger, and peace. In many cases they have made important progress, and my remarks today are not meant to demean these great institutions nor to belittle their impressive achievements. My point is that while we must recognize the importance of vast multipurpose institutions like the United Nations and its subsidiaries, like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and like the Common Market, we should also recognize their limitations and realize the necessity for new thrusts in new directions in international institution building.

For the U.N., NATO, and the Common Market are, after all, the creatures of diplomacy. They were created and are maintained to serve the ends and deal with the problems of their creators: the governments of nations. They are, therefore, political in nature. Their direction, and, indeed, their very existence, depends upon the vague winds of high international politics. Because of this they are not well equipped or well suited to deal with the practical day-to-day problems of international business life. For example, the current financial crisis in the U.N. could easily paralyze the whole range of U.N. operations. Furthermore, the U.N. is a preserve of the diplomats, and diplomats are too often hampered by what I call the "strictures of structures." Strict guidelines must be laid down by his government before a diplomat can talk to another diplomat who is in turn similarly restricted by carefully detailed instructions from his own government. Clearly these "strictures of structures" decidedly limit the flexibility of diplomats in dealing with hard, very real day-to-day problems.

It then becomes the responsibility of those outside Government who find themselves working toward common goals in a common community to build new institutions with new ideas to satisfy more mundane needs and provide solutions to the practical problems of international life on a different level.

It is in this spirit that we now launch the idea of building a new institution; a Pacific Bankers Association. As my colleagues in the House will remember, some time ago I discussed extensively my concept of the Pacific community. This is a transoceanic community of free nations rimming the vast Pacific basin, a community of Japan and Korea, of Taiwan, the Philippines, and Hong Kong; of Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand, and indeed, of the west coast and the Pacific islands of our own United States of America.

In connection with this, I was later privileged to speak here in our Capital before a Japanese Trade Commission sent here specifically to study the possibilities of expanding trade to new areas and to solve some of the problems in connection with existing trade relations. At that time, I suggested that we perhaps needed to follow up the recently established Asian Development Bank with a more informal institution for the Pacific community: a Pacific Bankers' Association. I engaged in extensive correspondence with leading governmental, banking, and financial officials in the Pacific community. Almost 130 letters were sent out. The list of those we sent letters to and those we received replies from are listed in the appendix of this speech.

I am happy to report that I received numerous and encouraging responses indicating the widespread support for a Pacific Bankers' Association. To quote from some of the many letters we received, Pacific bankers feel "a need for increased cooperation between bankers and businessmen from countries in the Pacific area." Further, an association for Pacific bankers could serve to "exchange information on credit," to "expose each nation's representatives to the customs and special conditions of other countries," to "develop a spirit of cooperation in achieving a common goal," and to "serve to build up a vast network of personal contacts which could play a vital role in building the understanding and confidence upon which trade depends."

Owing to the affirmative response to our query we feel that present Pacific institutions could well be supplemented by the formation of a Pacific Bankers' Association, and we now call for an informal meeting to be called by the bankers and their affiliates who share a common interest in the Pacific basin to discuss its structure and bylaws.

From our contacts with countries in the Pacific basin, it is agreed that such an organization could make great contributions. Its formation could serve:

First. To promote and foster international Pacific banking and trade by appropriate measures toward the stimulation of public interest therein and to undertake programs of common benefit.

For example, the Pacific Bankers' Association would perform a great service toward international banking by developing educational programs for Pacific member banks. This could follow patterns similar to the existing SEANZA course for central bankers.

The association could also act as a regional reference point in providing relevant information as regard special investment opportunities in Pacific countries. Information relevant to the formation of joint ventures would be provided by company representatives resident in the respective countries. Again, the Association would be a focal point for organization and distribution.

Member banks could also exchange information on credit through the Association.

Second. To improve existing machinery of international Pacific banking and trade through mutual cooperation and exchange of ideas.

For example, Pacific member banks could arrange through the Association a consortium to handle and underwrite larger types of risks involved in joint ventures or other investments. This would make available much larger resources to spread the risks among the portfolios of all banks involved.

The association could also act as an intermediary channel to study easier and more efficient methods for settling international accounts of member banks.

Third. To build up more personal contacts outside government.

For example, the Association could encourage and arrange for exchange missions involving banking and technical personnel between related industries in Pacific countries. Such technical exchange missions would become a most valuable instrument toward improving understanding via mutual contacts and cooperation between member Pacific countries.

Fourth. To sponsor productivity centers within developed and underdeveloped countries.

In recent years, both developed and underdeveloped countries in the Asian-Pacific area have been increasingly concerned with the problem of raising their general productivity to meet rising competition in world markets.

To increase international trade, exporting countries must have access to information concerning methods in marketing, distribution, and so forth, of the importing country. They must also produce goods and services which the importing countries have grown accustomed to in terms of quality standards, packaging, and so forth. Therefore the association could provide a greatly needed service of mutual benefit by sponsoring a productivity center to increase Pacific trade. Of course, increased trade also enhances the profit potentials of all member banks.

The productivity centers could be designed to function along the following general lines: To aid exporting companies to adjust to quality standards and other requirements for consumption in importing countries; to provide information and training on marketing, advertising and distribution; to perform research in developing new demands in developed countries for goods and services from underdeveloped countries; to provide management and technical consultants; to provide library facilities for statistics, technical books and periodicals, and translations of relevant information.

We realize the difficulties of international institution building at any level and the long protracted discussions which are necessary before real progress becomes apparent. A Pacific Bankers' Association would suffer from no less than the problems outlined by Mr. C. R. Darvall, general manager of the Australia and New Zealand Bank, Ltd.—a diversity in the countries of the Pacific area in relation to cultures, stages of economic development, forms of government, degrees of political stability and national aspirations.

However, may we point out that it is exactly in the banking institution where we have people who first break through these barriers. After all, outside of government, the banking community has always indicated a concern with, and knowledge about immediate and future needs in international economic, financial, and political developments. Indeed, we are all most fortunate to have bankers who are all natural internationalists by profession.

Therefore, let us once more strongly urge Pacific bankers to call for an informal meeting to discuss the formation of a Pacific Bankers' Association. In this manner, another cornerstone would be laid toward the final formation of a Pacific Community.

The appendix referred to follows:

APPENDIX

AUSTRALIA

Bank of New South Wales, 341 George Street, Sydney, Australia.

The Commercial Banking Company of Sydney Limited, 343 George Street, Sydney, Australia.

Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia, Pitt Street & Martin Place, Sydney, Australia.

Australia & New Zealand Bank Ltd., 394–396 Collins Street, Melbourne, Australia.

The Commercial Bank of Australia Ltd., 335–339 Collins Street, Melbourne, Australia.

The English, Scottish & Australian Bank Limited, 287 Collins Street, Melbourne, Australia.

The National Bank of Australasia Limited, 287–285 Collins, Melbourne, Australia.

CANADA

The Bank of Nova Scotia, 44 King Street W., Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

The Bank of Montreal, Corner of King & Bay Streets, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, 25 King Street W., Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

The Royal Bank of Canada, The Royal Bank of Canada Bldg., Place Ville Marie, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

The Toronto Dominion Bank, King & Bay Streets, Toronto, Canada.

The Mercantile Bank of Canada, 491 Victoria Square, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Banque Canadienne Nationale, 511 Place d'Armes, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

La Banque Provinciale du Canada, The Provincial Bank of Canada, 221 St. James St., W., Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

HONG KONG

The Bank of Canton, Ltd., 6 Des Voeux Road Central, Hong Kong.

Bank of East Asia, Ltd., 10, Des Voeux Road, Central, Hong Kong.

The Chartered Bank, 4, Des Voeux Road, Central, Hong Kong.

Chekiang First Bank, Ltd., 3 Wardley Street, Hong Kong.

Hang Tai Cheung Kee Bank, Ice House Street, Hong Kong.

The Hong Kong & Shanghai Banking Corp., 1 Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong.

Kwong On Bank, Ltd., 137–141 Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong.

Shanghai Commercial Bank Ltd., 12 Queen's Road, Hong Kong.

Wing Lung Bank Ltd., 110–114 Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong.

The Wing On Bank Ltd., 22 Des Voeux Road, Central, Hong Kong.

JAPAN

The Daiwa Bank, Ltd., 21 Bingomachi 2-chome, Higashiku, Osaka, Japan.

The Sanwa Bank Limited, Fushimi-machi 4, Osaka, Japan.

The Sumitomo Bank, Ltd., 22, 5-chome Kitahama, Higashi-ku, Osaka, Japan.

The Dai-Ichi Bank, Ltd., 1, 1-chome Marunouchi, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.

The Bank of Tokyo, Ltd., 6, 1-chome, Nihombashi, Hongo-Kucho, Chuo-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.

The Long-Term Credit Bank of Japan, Ltd., 1, Otemachi 1-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

The Mitsubishi Bank, Ltd., 5, 2-chome, Marunouchi Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.

The Nippon Kangyo Bank Ltd., Hibiya, Tokyo, Japan.

The Tokai Bank, Ltd., 1, Sakaemachi 2-chome, Naka-Ku, Nagoya, Japan.

The Fuji Bank, Ltd., 1-chome, Otemachi, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.

KOREA

Bank of Korea, 110–3 ka Namdaemoon-Ro, Chung-Ku, Seoul, Korea.

The Cho-Heung Bank, Ltd., 14, 1-ka Namdaemoon-Ro, Choong-ku, Seoul, Korea.

The Commercial Bank of Korea, Ltd., 111 Namdaemoon-Ro, Seoul, Korea.

The First City Bank of Korea, 53–1, 1-ka, Chungmuro, Joong-ku, Seoul, Korea.

The Han-11 Bank, Ltd., 130, 2 ka Namdaemoon-Ro, Choong-ku, Seoul, Korea.

MALAYSIA

Kwong Yik (Selangor) Banking Corp. Ltd., 75 Jalan Bandar, Kuala Lumpur, Federation of Malaysia.

Malayan Banking Ltd., 92 Jalan Bandar, Kuala Lumpur, Federation of Malaysia.

The Oriental Bank of Malaysia.

NEW ZEALAND

Australia & New Zealand Bank, Ltd., 196 Featherstone Street, Wellington, New Zealand.

Bank of New Zealand, 239–247 Lambton Quay, Wellington, New Zealand.

The National Bank of New Zealand, Ltd., 182 Featherstone Street, Wellington, C. I., New Zealand.

Bank of New South Wales, 318–322 Lambton Quay, Wellington, New Zealand.

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Bank of the Philippine Islands, 150 Plaza Cervantes, P.O. Box 777, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

China Banking Corporation, 108 Juan Luna Cor. Dasmarinas, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Citizens Bank & Trust Co., 411 Rosario Street, Binondo, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Commercial Bank & Trust Company, J. M. Tuason Bldg., Escolta, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Equitable Banking Corp., 262 Juan Luna, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Far East Bank & Trust Co., Muralla Street, P.O. Box 1411, Intromuros, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

The Manila Banking Corp., Escolta, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Metropolitan Bank & Trust Co., Wellington Building, Plaza Calderon, Binondo, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

The Overseas Bank of Manila, 410 Rosario Street, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Pacific Banking Corporation, 460 Rosario Street, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Philippine Bank of Communications, 216 Juan Luna Street, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

The Philippine Bank of Commerce, 377 Plaza Santa Cruz, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Philippine Commercial & Industrial Bank, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Philippine National Bank, Escolta, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Philippine Trust Company, Plaza Coiti, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Republic Bank, 277 Escolta, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Security Bank & Trust Company, 371 Escolta, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Prudential Bank & Trust Company, No. 1 Plaza Coiti, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

SINGAPORE

Chung Khiaw Bank, Ltd., 59 Robinson Road, Singapore.

Far Eastern Bank, Ltd., 137–139 Cecil Street, Singapore.

The Industrial & Commercial Bank, Ltd., 117–119 Cecil Street, Singapore.

Lee Wah Bank, Ltd., 18 South Canal Road, Singapore.

Oversea-Chinese Banking Corp. Ltd., China Building, Chulia Street, Singapore.

Overseas Union Bank, Ltd., Raffles Place, Singapore.

Sze Hai Tong Bank, Ltd., 57 Chulia Street, Singapore.

United Overseas Bank, Ltd., 2 Chulia Street, Singapore.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Ngan Hang Quoc Gia Viet-Nam (Banque Nationale du Vietnam), 17 Quay Chuong Duong, Saigon, South Vietnam.

Viet-Nam Thoung-tin (Credit Commercial du Viet-Nam), 17 Ben Chuong Duong, Saigon, South Vietnam.

TAIWAN

Overseas Chinese Commercial Banking Corp., 102 Heng Yang Road, Taipei, Taiwan, China.

Bank of China, 15, Chungshan Road, North Second Section, Taipei, Taiwan, China.

Bank of Communications, 39 O'Mei Street, Taipei, Taiwan, China.

THAILAND

Bangkok Bank, Ltd., P.O. Box 95, 3–9 Plapplachai Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Bangkok Bank of Commerce Ltd., 171 Suriwongse Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Bangkok Metropolitan Bank, Ltd., 186–96 Rajawongse Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

Bank of Asia for Industry & Commerce Ltd., 601 Samyek, Chareon Krung Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Bank of Aydhya, Ltd., Lampoonchai/Jawaraj Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Laem Thong Bank, Ltd., 289–9 Suriwongse Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Thai Military Bank, Ltd., Mansion 2, Raja Damnem Ave., Bangkok, Thailand.

The Union Bank of Bangkok, Ltd., 624 Jawarad Road, Samyek, Bangkok, Thailand.

Wang Lee Chan Bank, Ltd., 1130 Wathong Dhumchat, Donburi, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Provincial Bank Limited, 632 Mahachai Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Siam City Bank, Limited, 13 Anuwongse Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Siam Commercial Bank, Ltd., 1280 Yodha Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Thai Danu Bank, Ltd., Mahachai & Jawaraj Roads, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Thai Farmers Bank, Ltd., 306 Suapa Road, P.O. Box 1366, Bangkok, Thailand.

UNITED STATES

Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association, 300 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Plaza, New York, N.Y.

First National City Bank, 399 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Chemical Bank New York Trust Co., 20 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

Wells Fargo Bank, 464 California Street, San Francisco, California.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from California, the Honorable RICHARD T. HANNA, in his plea for meetings between bankers in this country, Canada, and the Orient to discuss the possibilities of forming a Pacific Bankers' Association. Representative HANNA is to be commended for the initiation of this proposal and for the groundwork he has laid by corresponding with bankers in Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Singapore, South Vietnam, Taiwan, Thailand, and the United States.

A proposed association of bankers like this has dynamic potential for the countries involved and for the Pacific area, in which I am vitally interested, particularly because of the implications for my State of Hawaii. Such an association would offer many benefits to its members in the form of mutual exchange of information on credit, on investment opportunities, on market potentials, and a variety of other topics of great utility to the economic progress of the nations involved.

Earlier this year, the Congress approved, and the President signed, a bill to create an Asian Development Bank, and I envision the Pacific Bankers' Association as a potential private counterpart, with many similar functions but with many services to its members that the Asian Development Bank was not designed to perform.

Like the Asian Development Bank, the Pacific Bankers' Association could be instrumental in aiding the underdeveloped countries in the Pacific region to speed up their economic development, specifically by providing the type of information and coordination necessary to stimulate export and import operations. Not only would current information and future prognostications about markets for various goods and raw materials be useful, but also the association could serve as a clearinghouse for details as to quality and standards necessary for a member nation to share in international trade.

The association would be a forum for members to meet personally and exchange ideas and information and would thereby serve an educational function for those nations striving to catch up with the competition. By disseminating information to financial institutions around the world, it could attract investment capital so badly needed if the Pacific region is to prosper in relation to the rest of the world. International financial dealings could be coordinated and expedited through cooperative arrangements worked out between members of such an association, facilitating the exchange of goods and materials.

Though we have several international organizations, such as the Asian Development Bank mentioned previously, already operating in promoting economic progress in the Pacific region, the Pacific Bankers' Association would provide a vital impetus from the private sector by enlisting the participation of banks in the area and by encouraging private citizens to consider the products and industry of this region as potential sources of investment.

I second Representative HANNA's call to the bankers of the Pacific nations to meet with representatives of the Western Hemisphere to conduct discussions into the possibilities of such a Pacific Bankers' Association. Nothing would be lost, and the potential benefits are inestimable.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] for his excellent presentation and for his leadership in advancing an exciting and dynamic concept in international relations: the establishment of a Pacific Bankers' Association.

To test the feasibility of establishing such an institution, he has willingly assumed the responsibility of seeking the written opinions of leading governmental, banking, and financial officials in the nations which are found in the Pacific basin. The responses he has received are not only encouraging, but they point to a definite need for an institution such as a Pacific Bankers' Association.

It is entirely fitting and proper that the United States should assume a leading role in the formation of such an institution. As we know, in the years since World War II the United States has pioneered in the field of cultural and technical interchange between the East and West through the East-West Center in Hawaii. We have already seen the incalculable benefits which have flowed from this institution to the peoples of Asia and America.

In other spheres of international relations among Pacific nations we have recently witnessed the establishment of the Asian and Pacific Cooperation Council, the Asian Development Bank and Mekong River project.

The future holds even greater promise for all countries which lie within or along the rim of the vast Pacific basin. This was perceptively stated by our President in his July 12 address on Asian policy. He said that one of the three essentials upon which our Asian policy must be based is the building of political and economic strength among the nations of free Asia. And I am convinced that the establishment and development of a Pacific Bankers' Association would help a great deal to build the economic strength of the nations in the Pacific.

The proposed Pacific Bankers' Association, as a privately initiated and privately sponsored institution of international scope, deserves our wholehearted encouragement and support.

TOY MANUFACTURERS ASKED TO REFRAIN FROM ADVERTISING TOYS OF VIOLENCE: GRABOWSKI URGES PARENTS NOT TO BUY SUCH TOYS THIS CHRISTMAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks Americans have been

confronted with news stories depicting death and violence. Stories which seem almost incredible; but, unfortunately, are pitifully true.

On July 28 of this year, the FBI released its annual "Uniform Crime Reports—1965" which, according to Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, disclose there were more than 2¾ million serious crimes in the United States in 1965, an increase of 6 percent over 1964.

I should like to quote from a news release from the FBI, dated July 28, which states:

> The crimes of violence—murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, aggravated assault, and robbery—rose 6 percent as a group while crimes against property—burglary, larceny $50 and over in value and auto theft—likewise recorded a 6-percent upward trend. Since 1960 the total volume of serious crimes reported in the United States has risen 46 percent with the violent crimes showing a 35-percent rise and the property crimes a 47-percent jump.
>
> In discussing crime costs FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover noted that during 1965 there were more than 5,600 murders, 34,700 aggravated assaults with a gun, and over 68,400 robberies where a weapon was used. The value of goods stolen in robberies, larcenies, and auto thefts exceeded $1 billion.

To quote these statistics, Mr. Speaker, is to indicate that crimes of violence are ever presently on the increase.

The point of my remarks is to place no blame on anyone. Rather it is to call to the attention of two responsible segments of our society—the toy manufacturers and parents—the need for their active participation in promoting toys of peace, not toys of violence and death.

Who is to say that toys which promote violence do not psychologically and adversely affect our children?

We do not know that Richard Speck and Charles Whitman, as children, played with toys which psychologically placed them in news headlines upon attaining adulthood. But who will defend these toys of violence as instruments for healthy minds and bodies?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have a right to ask our toy manufacturers and distributors to refrain from advertising those products which depict violence and death.

Would it not be better to advertise a toy as one of constructive beneficence rather than one of destructive powers?

What better time to begin thinking about this than now—just 124 shopping days from Christmas? Christmas. That day of the year when we celebrate the birth of Christ, the Prince of Peace—not the day for celebrating the birth of the vicar of violence.

America's children look upon Christmas as a time of receiving toys. Many of them, unfortunately, are prone to forget that this is the day of the Prince of Peace's birth. Therefore, our children's whimsical hearts and minds are influenced by the suggestive power of advertising, and they ask for those toys that are advertised—and primarily via the media of television, a media which affords the demonstration of the mobility and violence of a toy.

Children can view on television the toy depicting how one can kill, injure, and maim individuals whether it be a superduper rocketgun, a nine-way-to-fire machinegun, or a toy hand grenade.

Frankly, we cannot ask our toy manufacturers to refrain from producing such toys of violence; for, if we did, we would be violating the spirit of free enterprise upon which this great Nation has been founded and prospered. But, we can ask them to refrain and restrain from depicting the toys as those of destructive force.

Why cannot our toy manufacturers who devise a superduper cannon or an ugly robot who kills, promote and teach our children through toys of an educational and/or cultural value?

For instance, why cannot toy advertising promote "Buy your child a train—the vehicle which won the West"? Or, "Promote your child's scientific talents through a chemistry set this Christmas"? Or, "Learn safe driving habits through a speed racer set"?

But, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for developing healthy minds and bodies of our youngsters does not lie with toy manufacturers alone. It lies also with the buyer, and particularly, the parents.

I urge every parent this Christmas to refrain from buying those products which may maim the mind of your child and at the same time produce within the child an emotional, traumatic experience which later may affect his adult life.

I am confident that if we celebrate this coming Christmas with toys of peace that we will be more in keeping with the celebration of the birth of Christ—the Prince of Peace—than celebrating the day with purchases of toy .38's, tomahawks, and other terror weapons.

A BILL TO PROVIDE A 5-PERCENT INCREASE IN THE RATE OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION PAYABLE TO VETERANS DISABLED FROM SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SCHISLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House of Representatives a bill which provides a 5-percent increase in the rate of disability compensation payable to veterans disabled from service-connected disabilities.

Under the present laws a veteran with a disability incurred during peacetime is compensated only 80 percent of the rate which is paid to a veteran who receives his disability during time of war. I strongly feel that there should be no differential between rates paid to peacetime service-connected veterans and wartime service-connected veterans. Therefore, my bill contains a provision to provide that differential between rates shall be eliminated and the peacetime service-connected veteran shall be paid compensation at the same rate as the wartime service-connected veterans.

I might also add that the existing law provides a different rate in death compensation paid to parents of veterans who die from disabilities incurred during peacetime than those who die from disabilities incurred in wartime service. This differential does not exist in the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to dependent parents. Therefore, I feel that it should not exist in the payment of death compensation; so my bill further provides to eliminate the difference between wartime and peacetime death compensation as well as disability compensation.

Of all the recipients of Federal benefits, our veterans who are disabled from disabilities incurred during their military service are most deserving of this Congress attention; so I am hopeful that the proposals contained in my bill will receive early and favorable consideration.

A BILL TO INCREASE NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION RATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to provide a greatly needed and most deserved increase in the non-service-connected pension rates payable to veterans and to their widows and to also increase certain income limitations as well as provide outpatient medical services to veterans of World War I and medicines and drugs to certain additional veterans. I wish to emphasize that under the provisions of my bill not only are the pension rates for veterans and widows receiving benefits under the so-called new pension program increased but also the pension rates for veterans and widows receiving benefits under the so-called old pension program are increased.

Over 1,200,000 veterans now receive non-service-connected pensions of whom over 965,000 are veterans of World War I. Approximately 900,000 widows and an additional 200,000 children of deceased veterans will receive additional benefits under the provisions of my bill. It provides for a $5 monthly increase in the pension rates payable to all veterans and widows receiving benefits under the so-called new pension program. Moreover, it provides further assistance to the veterans and widows with the lower incomes by increasing the income limitation of the lowest income bracket from $600 to $800. For veterans and widows with dependents, the present income limitation for the $1,000 to $2,000 income bracket is increased to $2,200.

Veterans receiving benefits under the old pension law have not received an in-

crease since 1954. Therefore, my bill proposes to increase to $67 monthly the rate for the veteran under 65 and who has been on the pension role for less than 10 years and to $80 monthly for the veteran 65 years of age and over or who has been continuously on the pension role for 10 years or more. Also, the aid-and-attendance allowance for veterans under the old pension program would be increased to $140 monthly. My bill also proposes to increase the pension rates payable to widows under the old law who also have not had an increase since 1954, to $55 monthly or $67 monthly if they have a minor child with $9 monthly for each additional child.

Because of his limited income and age, one of the greatest problems facing the World War I veteran receiving a nonservice-connected pension is being able to afford adequate medical treatment. My bill further proposes that the Veterans' Administration shall grant outpatient treatment to World War I veterans for any disabilities for which outpatient treatment is needed regardless of whether or not the disability is service connected. This provision of the bill now grants to the World War I veteran the same outpatient treatment benefit that has previously been granted to veterans of the Spanish-American War and Indian Wars.

Under the existing laws the veterans presently receiving pensions with the special aid-and-attendance allowance under the new pension program may be furnished by the Veterans' Administration drugs or medicines ordered on a prescription by duly licensed physicians. This veteran may also be furnished an invalid lift if medically indicated, as well as other medical equipment and supplies. These benefits are not now available to a veteran receiving a pension with the special aid-and-attendance allowance under the old law, but my bill proposes to also furnish these benefits to him.

Certainly the increase in benefits which is proposed in my bill would be most helpful to all veterans, including those of World War I. However, I feel that the provision providing for the outpatient medical treatment for World War I veterans, which would be a new benefit for them, would prove to be of the greatest benefit to these veterans.

NO QUICK VICTORY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson—certain critics to the contrary—has never attempted to create any illusions about the prospects for success in Vietnam.

He laid it on the line again when he recently spoke to the press with our commander in Vietnam, General Westmoreland.

The Scripps Howard newspaper in Washington, the Daily News, comments approvingly on the candor of the President's remarks. As part of an editorial on the subject, the newspaper quotes this statement:

> The American people must know that there will be no quick victory, but the world must know that we will not quit.

That, says the editorial, is as flat and frank as you can get.

To assure my colleagues of a chance to read this commentary, I offer it now for printing in the RECORD:

NO QUICK VICTORY

President Johnson has been accused by his political critics of having shown a "lack of candor" in telling the American people about the difficulties of the Viet Nam war. Yet it would be hard for anybody to make that charge in the light of the President's statement yesterday at the Texas ranch as he sat alongside Gen. Westmoreland, our Viet Nam commander, and faced the press.

It was a confident but somber statement that should lay to rest any false hopes that the job we are trying to do there will be cheap, easy or quick.

The allies, said the President, will not be defeated. The communists cannot win. Our task is to convince the communists they cannot win, that their only course is to quit fighting or agree to a negotiated peace. And our determination and patience to persist in Viet Nam until the communists recognize the hopelessness of their efforts is now "the single most important factor" in the war.

The communists will be turned back, said the President. But, "no one can say when this will be, or how many men will be needed, or how long we must persevere. The American people must know that there will be no quick victory, but the world must know that we will not quit."

That is as flat and frank as you can get.

ADDRESS BY HON. ANTONIO ARROYO ALFARO

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, one of our closest and most valued friends in the free world is the Republic of Costa Rica with its understanding government and democratic people.

I have had the pleasure of visiting Costa Rica and have a high personal regard for its people and institutions.

While on a recent visit I addressed the Costa Rican Congress following an introduction by the Honorable Antonio Arroyo Alfaro, a leading member of that body.

I respectfully submit this introductory speech for the RECORD at this time.

[Translation (Spanish)]

REMARKS DELIVERED BY DEPUTY ANTONIO ARROYO ALFARO ON THE OCCASION OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN DENT'S VISIT

Mr. JOHN DENT, Member of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, Mr. President of the Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica, Messrs. Deputies, today we have suspended our daily task of frank and patriotic discussion of national affairs to receive the visit of the very distinguished member of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, Honorable JOHN DENT.

In the name of my colleagues I wish to express to him that his visit makes us extremely happy because he is an outstanding and distinguished figure in the realm of politics of that great nation.

And that his visit honors us because he is a representative of the people and the Government of the United States.

In greeting such a distinguished guest we would like, at the same time, to profess to him our friendship, declare our solidarity, and convey our admiration, appreciation and respect, conducive as our expressions are to making patent all the things that join us together with that great nation.

Historically and politically the United States and all of our Latin America have taken the same course.

And the same well-springs of political philosophy which inspired the great builders of the United States were drawn on also to satisfy the yearning for independence, freedom, progress and justice that was stirring in the hearts and minds of all American patriots.

In effect, almost at the same time, during the same stage of history, our nations obtained their independence and thus ceased to depend on Europe for attaining autonomy and their own physiognomy among the nations of the world.

The same way of thinking which designed the constitutional fabric of the United States also laid the foundations for our legal systems. We too recognize that man is a rational being, naturally good, morally responsible, that he is an aim to himself, with the absolute right to govern his own destiny. We believe in the equal rights of the human family, and that the happiness of the individual is the only just purpose of the government. We believe that the will of the people is the only just foundation of any government; and that it must always be our primary objective to protect the free expression of that will. We believe that all human beings, besides being born free and equal, are endorsed with certain inalienable rights, and that in order to guarantee those rights, governments are instituted which derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We also believe that man's political activity as well as his private life are subject to a fair hearing by his peers; and that in complex situations, freedom must be reconciled with authority and the just balance must be sought between the individual freedom and the requirements of the general welfare [in a democratic society].

We also believe that the law is an instrument by means of which justice is shaped by the will of the majority which makes reason prevail and causes progress to advance according to a predetermined course. And we believe in the rule of law as the supreme instrument of government, public order, and security.

The [same] thought patterns, historical events, and our geographical union have been the great causes [links?] which have kept our countries united with yours. And therefore we can say that there is also a community of ideals.

Together with our beloved Costa Rican patricians, with the worthy principles and guide-lines, and with the great Latin American idealists, we carry, deeply rooted in our hearts, the memory of the great North American figures:

Thomas Jefferson, whose doctrine inspired the democratic system and influenced the formative years of the United States as a nation;

Abraham Lincoln, The Great Emancipator, great humanist, world figure, example to youth, a man of vision and merit, the love for whom is growing day by day;

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Father of the Good-Neighbor Policy, who so greatly helped this Continent;

John F. Kennedy, who is already occupying one of the most prominent places among the pleiades of great men of the United States and who was able to win for himself the sincere affection of all Latin Americans.

George Washington, John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster, Alexander Hamilton, Woodrow Wilson, Benjamin Franklin, and many others, all of them men of genius and of brilliant intellect, who have been admired and revered by us since the days of our youth.

We Costa Ricans are following with keen interest the products of American thinking in all areas of learning, in philosophy as well as in politics, in the sciences as well as in economics, etc. Through the years a tide of admiration has been forming which is increasing its influence on us. In the American projects and realizations we have observed at all times a universal, fair, and noble criterion, we have seen an interrelationship between things religious and political, we note a practicing of certain universal principles which convince us more and more of the importance of that system's survival and of the necessity for remaining united.

The rapprochement of all countries of America in order to attain greater community of ideals and purposes, and to make the pursuit of our common purposes more workable, is becoming more urgent and necessary every day. The steps which have been taken in recent years and the achievements made up to now, have brought about a notable change and it is felt by all of us. And there is in the hearts of all Latin Americans the good will to contribute to the closest possible Pan American union.

I wonder whether it would not be a good idea for all of our governments to finance and maintain a carrier service, with the permanent mission of establishing closer relations, carrying abroad representatives of all ages and all levels of all countries, so that on visits to our countries, on frequent trips, they would become more aware of what the American Continent is like. On repeated visits of students, businessmen, professionals, and workers of all countries we would get to know one another better and become more closely acquainted.

We understand perfectly that in the international area we must maintain the same posture of unity and solidarity, not only in the interest of promoting our common ideals but also with an eye on defense in the face of threats from the outside which are also threats to all Americans alike.

We fervently believe in the principle of free determination for our nations.

But I also wonder whether it may not be convenient to further strengthen and invigorate the democratic system, common to all our countries, by the creation of an international organization made up of representatives of all our nations, and designed to advise, organize, and maintain the national political organs entrusted with the holding of free political elections in all our countries, and whether it would not be convenient for that international body to have the important function of supervision and control with respect to the clean functioning of the entire political election system in all our Republics, which would guarantee its correct functioning and, through it, the functioning of free determination which is the sovereign function of all these States. The international guarantee would serve to achieve the free functioning of the national sovereignties, and would neither destroy nor limit the national independence since, on the contrary, it would invigorate it. The day on which the American people will help one another attain the free exercise of the political freedoms we will have taken an honest step forward toward improvement of the general welfare and of peace for our countries. This is more and more necessary. Because as the individual living in a society, must allow a limitation of his own freedom and sovereignty in order to guarantee the freedom and sovereignty of the others, and it will be necessary to limit the rights of the others in order to guarantee to the individual the enjoyment of his rights, so must our Latin American nations also accept limitations of their sovereignty in the interest of the general welfare.

I wanted to leave for the conclusion of my remarks a small reference to the Alliance for Progress Program.

We American countries were actually glad to receive President Kennedy's message of March 13, 1961, in which he proposed the Alliance for Progress Program. Our ears are still ringing with the words of that great President, whose memory is revered in all of America and who has nowadays become number one in the heart of all Latin Americans.

"Alliance for Progress and Economic Development" are today the goals in which we invest greatest interest and concern. It is our first opportunity to give our country the great push forward which it has been needing, and we are willing to do so.

We realize that our continent is rich in natural resources and in manpower. We are aware of the still prevailing bad conditions. We want to make the change. We want progress and we would like to attain it through our own efforts and your help.

Thinking of the promising future that is awaiting us, we would like to get together all representatives of this country, all its productive forces, in order to try to do an intelligent and patriotic job which would be the fruit of the effort and the cooperation of all.

We want a policy of development based on an overall program, with concrete objectives, to be the fruit of the discussion of all and of the advice of the informed. We aspire to achieve, within the frame of prevailing conditions and within the realm of possibility, the maximum utilization of our natural and human resources. We want every investment to be applied in such a way as to ensure the greatest possible benefit, from the economic and social point of view. And with this purpose in mind, we want to embark first on a study of our necessities and possibilities and resources, and then establish our possibilities of development and determine our objectives, with priorities and preferences, concerning the use of resources available to us. It will be our aspiration to attain the highest goal possible within our limited possibilities.

I want to emphasize that we deem the participation of the State necessary as an instrument through which all resources of the nation will be applied to the achievement of the great objective. That participation is necessary in order to stimulate and to help create the necessary conditions for private initiative to grow and expand; but we are not thinking of state control of the economy in terms as to suggest the destruction of private initiative.

But we want to mention, in particular, Mr. DENT, that one of the most effective ways in which the people and the Government of the United States could aid the development of our economies is by helping us secure better prices for our vital export products.

And we would like to call your attention and, through you, to the attention of the distinguished government officials of your country, the very great importance which lies in securing those better prices which must come to the aid of our progress and development.

We would like our prices to be made an object of an economic protectionism within the United States herself; because, if that philosophy was useful in creating the economic power of that great nation, it should, for the sake of American solidarity, for the sake of justice, be useful in helping the weak economic sector of the Continent. How wonderful it would be for us to have the great American nation help us with that program! How much more solid and vigorous a fraternal spirit would spring up all over America as a response to that policy!

Mr. DENT, in extending to you, in the name of my colleagues, our warmest welcome, we wish to reiterate our sentiments of fervent adhesion to and friendship for the United States of America.

You are very welcome in our land which feels greatly honored by your visit and which welcomes you as one of our own!

[Translated by Elizabeth Hanunian]

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS G. CORBIN

Mr. PATTEN. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years Maj. Gen. Thomas G. Corbin has served both the Air Force and the Congress as Director of Legislative Liaison in the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force. During that time he has become a familiar figure on Capitol Hill and has done an outstanding job of furthering Air Force congressional relations.

General Corbin is now leaving for a new assignment as commander of the Special Air Warfare Center at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to this officer for his outstanding service as Director of Legislative Liaison which typifies a distinguished military career.

General Corbin graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1941 and immediately underwent flying training. On being awarded his wings he joined the 44th Bomb Group at Barksdale Field, La., until his transfer to the European theater. General Corbin was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action while flying B-26's with the 386th Bomb Group which he later commanded.

In 1945 General Corbin became the air inspector of the Air Training Command and later commanded the 91st Air Base Group, McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. Later he attended the Royal Air Force Staff College on completion of which he commanded the airbases at Sculthorpe and Brize Norton, England.

In 1953 General Corbin was assigned as provost marshal for the Strategic Air Command and a short while later became the deputy commander of the First Air Division at Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr. He attended the National War College in 1957 and thereafter assumed command of the 4060th Air Refueling Wing at Dow Air Force Base, Maine. Just before being assigned to the post to which he is now leaving he was the commander of the 818th Strategic Aerospace Division at Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebr.

We will all miss General Corbin but I want to take this occasion to wish him every success in his new assignment.

CITIZENSHIP FOR CUBANS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, support for legislation to make Cuban refugees eligible for U.S. citizenship appears in a Hearst newspaper, the Baltimore News American.

The newspaper recalls that since Fidel Castro became dictator 7 years ago, more than 115,000 of his countrymen have fled to the United States. About 4,000 are still arriving each month by airlift.

Because of their special status, however, they are unable to qualify for citizenship.

The News American endorses bills backed by the administration to make them eligible. This is a welcome prospect, the newspaper declares editorially, both as a humanitarian gesture and a demonstration of our sincerity in urging others to seek the liberty we enjoy.

I submit this editorial for the RECORD.

CITIZENSHIP FOR CUBANS

Since Fidel Castro became dictator of Cuba seven years ago, more than 115,000 of his countrymen have fled to the United States. Some 4,000 are still arriving each month by airlift to Miami.

Although most of these refugees have proved to be hard-working and desirable additions to our population, they do not enjoy full freedom. They are on a special "paroled" status rather than as immigrants. None, as a result, can qualify for citizenship. Many professionals are unable to practice.

Bills now introduced in both houses of Congress would permit these people to become fully qualified citizens of the democracy they chose. The move has strong administration backing and adoption is expected. We welcome the prospect both as a humanitarian gesture and as a proper demonstration of our sincerity in urging others to seek the liberty we enjoy.

A CIVIC-MINDED INDUSTRY—CARLING BREWING CO.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, one often hears the expression "soulless corporation," and it has often been said that social welfare, as commonly construed, is not the concern of business. Such statements are not always true for there is a new theory that business will prosper from economic, social, and cultural advancement of the people who work in its plants and buy its products.

About 5 years ago, Carling Brewing Co. opened a new plant in the Halethorpe area of Baltimore County, and, from the start, success marked every step of its business operations. That company is, however, more than a mere successful concern; it is also a firm imbued with a civic consciousness and stands as an object lesson to all industries.

Recently, in the excellent Baltimore magazine, which is published monthly by the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan Baltimore, under the title "Miscellaneous File," due acknowledgment was made of the Carling Brewing Co.'s many and varied civic endeavors. Believing this to be a matter of general interest, I include this item in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

Birthday greetings are in order: Carling Brewing Company's Baltimore plant (that awesome, already-a-landmark structure you see from the west leg of the Beltway, in the Halethorpe area) is five years old. It was on May 16, 1961, when the beer began to flow, and since then, production has jumped from 385,000 to over a million barrels a year. This doesn't necessarily impress us; after all, the Carling people are businessmen, well versed in the complexities of manufacturing and marketing their product. No, the reason we want to call attention to the anniversary is found in the really amazing number of things Carling is doing around here, most of them far removed from up-ending a bottle of beer. (Besides, we've never been able to understand this business about thousands or millions of barrels, maybe because *one* barrel seems like a Niagara of suds to us.) The local Carling folk sponsor all manner of activities; last month, for example, there was the Carling Palm Sunday concert at Morgan. There's a Carling print collection at the Pratt, music scholarships at the University of Maryland, a scholarship award made in conjunction with the Baltimore Civic Opera; Carling has a cruise for veterans of Perry Point Hospital, an art exhibition at the famed old Charcoal Club. It sponsors the annual exhibit of the Baltimore Press Photographers Association. Sportswise? The months coming up are jam-packed: June sees the Carling Cruiser Classic, July 9–10 are the dates for the Carling Skeet Challenge Cup competition at Loch Raven. One of the area's nicest events is brewery-backed—the Lady Carling Open, which brings the top lady pros to Turf Valley. August 11–14 are the dates this year, and the gate money goes to KILD, a charity set up for the families of policemen killed in the line of duty. Other goings-on include the summer-long Ocean City Marlin Contest, the Carling Trap Challenge Cup and the Carling Cup Regatta, meaning hydroplane races; August 14 is the date. It strikes us that the brewery buys a lot of cups, and we think this is fine. But maybe somebody ought to present one to Bruce Wilson and his people for a job well done.

MISUSE OF U.S. FUNDS BY U.N. RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as an American and as a Member of the Congress of the United States, I feel it is my duty to most strongly protest against the misuse of American money by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency—UNRWA.

The United States is a heavy contributor to the assistance program administered by UNRWA; in funds and commodities, our Country contributes nearly two-thirds of UNRWA's budget.

Last month, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, chairman, Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Senate Judiciary Committee, at a hearing on refugees in the Middle East, said:

There are various substantial abuses in the UNRWA operations which should be condemned by all people truly interested in the welfare of the refugees—whether those concerned be Arab or not.

It has also come to my attention from various other sources that the United Nation-administered schools in Arab refugee camps inculcate hatred directed against the West and particularly against the United States and the State of Israel. Flagrant abuses and fraud in the refugee relief rolls in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and the Gaza strip were uncovered.

The United Arab Republic and Syria have an estimated 10,000 to 14,000 refugees serving in the so-called Palestine Liberation Army whose goal is the announced destruction of the State of Israel. The army's recruits, I understand, are regular recipients of food and relief supplies from the United Nations Relief and Works Agency—UNRWA.

It certainly is incompatible with the policy of the United States and with the original idea of the United Nations to supply material assistance to an army whose sole purpose is to destroy a member country of the U.N.

If our State Department and the U.N. are so ineffective as to be unable to stop the conditions described, I plan to vote against any appropriation of funds for the U.N.-administered schools or for the resettlement of refugees in the Near East. I have so advised Secretary of State Dean Rusk by letter dated August 15, 1966.

On July 29, 1966, the Baltimore Jewish Times published its Times' Letter From Israel, bearing on this matter, entitled "How Stupid Can One Get?" Because of the importance of this subject, I include it and my letter to the Secretary of State in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are as follows:

TIMES' LETTER FROM ISRAEL: HOW STUPID CAN ONE GET?

(By Eliezer Whartman)

JERUSALEM.—I recently met a Christian minister with whom I had long been acquainted in the United States. He had just crossed into Israel after a tour of the Arab states during which he visited a number of Arab refugee camps.

The picture that he presented of the camps was horrifying. It was not so much the physical condition of the camps which bothered him, for the refugees had a higher standard of living than the surrounding populations; it was the systematic inculcation of hatred, in the UN administered schools, directed at the West and Israel that caused his alarm. Children at a tender age were being taught that Israel was a monster which had to be exterminated, and that it

was the West—particularly the United States—which supported Israel and was, therefore, the real enemy of the Arabs.

For those of us who have been living in the Middle East for some time this was not new. We hear the Arab broadcasts daily, but it came as a shock to my friend who had been unaware of the virulence of western hatred among the refugees. Apparently it has shocked an American investigating mission headed by Senator TED KENNEDY which has just concluded a study of the camps. Here is a classic case of people biting the hand that feeds them, for the United States pays 70% of the cost of maintaining and educating the refugees. During the last seventeen years the total has come to a staggering half billion dollars, exclusive of the extensive grants-in-aid that America has made to the Arab governments. (In contrast, the Russians have not contributed a single ruble, nor have the Arab host governments.)

Today over a million and a quarter Arab refugees are on the UN relief rolls, despite the fact that less than half a million actually quit the country (based on the Mandatory Government census figures) in 1948. The chief reason for the swollen figure, according to a former United Nations Relief and Works Agency Director, Henry R. Labouisse, is accountable to the "wholesale holding of duplicate ration cards, fraudulent registrations, non-reporting of deaths, etc." This is admitted by the Arabs themselves. The Middle East Mirror (Vol. 7, No. 9, July 23rd, 1955) published by the Arab News Agency of Cairo declared: "There are refugees who hold as many as 500 UNRWA ration cards, 499 of them belonging to refugees long dead. They are dealers in UNRWA food and clothing, and sell ration cards to the highest bidder . . . Refugee capitalists is what the UNRWA calls them."

The Arab states have consistently refused to allow a census to be held in the camps to determine who holds the ration cards, who is living and who is dead, who has quit the camps and who is still there, etc. It is common knowledge that many Arab civil servants are carried on the rolls, and that the camps are a prime source of the lucrative black market which exists in these countries.

Worse, many holders of ration cards are enrolled in the so called "Arab Liberation Army" which receives training in guerrilla warfare and frequently engages in murderous raids into Israel.

There are some basic facts which should be known about the refugees. The claim they make that they were driven from their homes is, of course, false. Even the British, who were no friends of the Jews, have acknowledged that the Israelis tried to persuade them to remain. The fact is that those who remained enjoy a much higher standard of living than those who fled.

Secondly, it is claimed that the Jews seized their land. According to the British Mandatory figures of 1946, 70% of the land which now comprises Israel was in the public domain, including most of the Negev, which makes up more than half of the country, and vast stretches of the upper and lower Galilee. Of the remaining 30%, the Jews owned 9% and those Arabs who remained where they were owned at least 4%, which means that only about 17% of the land could accurately be described as abandoned. Israel has repeatedly offered to sit down with the Arab owners of this land and discuss compensation (most of these Arabs were wealthy absentee landlords whose land was tilled by sharecroppers) but the Arab states have consistently refused to allow this. Sir Alexander Galloway, the former head of the UNRWA in Jordan is on record as having stated: "The Arab states do not want to solve the refugee problem. They want to keep it as an open sore, as an affront to the United Nations, and as a weapon against Israel. The Arab leaders don't give a damn whether the refugees live or die." (As quoted in the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 8th, 1958).

"The fact that there are these refugees," declared Emil Choury, the Secretary of the Arab Higher Committee, as quoted in the Beirut Telegraph of Sept. 6th, 1948, "is a direct consequence of the action of the Arab states in opposing partition and the Jewish State. The Arab states agreed on this policy unanimously, and they must share in the solution of the problem."

This has been the point of view of the Congress as well. On June 7th, 1957, notice was served by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that it would not continue indefinitely providing relief for the refugees. The Foreign Aid bill adopted by the Senate that year reads: "In determining whether or not to continue furnishing assistance for Palestine refugees in the Near East, the President shall take into account whether the Arab host governments are taking steps toward the resettlement of the refugees . . ."

The following year the committee reiterated its stand: "It is the committee's view that the United States is not going to continue indefinitely to contribute to relief with no concrete evidence on the part of the states directly concerned that they are willing to take steps for the resolution of the problem. The Committee intends to reexamine this situation very carefully next year to ascertain whether continuation of this assistance is justified."

This "agonizing reappraisal" has been going on from year to year. The House of Representatives, too, which passes on all fiscal matters has consistently called for resettlement of the refugees "in lands where there is room and opportunity for them" but each year, at the urging of the State Department additional sums are voted for refugee relief.

The State Department takes the attitude that if the situation deteriorates in the camps, the refugees will turn to Communism and will try to overthrow existing regimes. The Arab leaders, too, warn of this danger. However, it is clear to even a child that if the refugees revolt, the first ones to hang will be the Arab leaders, and that if they want to have their necks, the refugee problem must be solved. But they are resolutely against solving it. Some of their comments are instructive. The Jordanian Government radio on Dec. 26th, 1960 declared: "Jordan will accept no solution to the Palestine problem that does not involve the liquidation of Israel." Nasser, in an interview quoted in the Swiss newspaper Zuericher Woche, Sept. 1st, 1961, asserted: "If the Arabs return to Israel, Israel will cease to exist." Leaders of the other Arab states have expressed similar sentiments.

If the Congress were to go ahead with its oft-repeated threats to stop all funds to the refugees unless immediate steps were taken to phase out the camps and begin resettlement in the Arab lands, the problem could be solved. The Arab leaders, to save their skins, would have to solve it. But Congress has been persuaded to go on footing the bill. There are many anti-Israel elements at work in the United States. These include church leaders of all denominations, missionary groups (who must appease the Arab states if their missionaries are to be permitted to continue their work in the Middle East) so called "educators," a few poltical leaders, etc. The most effective help received by anti-Israel groups comes from the Arabian-American Oil Company (Standard of New Jersey & California, Texaco and Socony Vacuum) who contribute heavily to these groups, and, of course, the State Department and various personalities in the Pentagon. The oil lobby, of course, has its own ax to grind, as do the church groups. A number of the anti-Israel public organizations receive sizeable grants from the Arab League. But it is the State Department (which is a story in itself) that is responsible, in the last analysis, for the present state of affairs.

The question is: how stupid can you get? Apparently, as far as the State Department is concerned, there's no limit.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1966.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am very much disturbed about the enclosed article which recently appeared in The Baltimore Jewish Times and I will appreciate an immediate detailed explanation from you as to why our State Department continues to permit the use of American funds for purposes outlined in this article.

It is inconceivable to me that the United Nations administered schools would permit the teaching of such hate and bigotry as outlined in the enclosed article while the people of the United States pay seventy percent of the cost of maintaining and educating these Arab refugees.

If our State Department and the United Nations are so ineffective as to be unable to stop the conditions described in the enclosed article, then I plan to vote against any legislation to provide any more funds for the U.N. administered schools or for the resettlement of refugees in the Near East. It is certainly time that the State Department realized that Israel is the only friend the United States has in this strategic Middle East and made it quite clear to the leaders of the Arab countries that no further funds will be provided by the United States as long as they maintain an attitude that "Israel must be liquidated."

It is my intention to have this article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to call to the attention of all the Members of the House the manner in which our Foreign Aid Funds are being spent to the detriment of the United States, rather than to win friends which is supposedly our intention.

Warmest regards.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
Member of Congress.

MODEL SECONDARY SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF ACT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill entitled the "Model Secondary School for the Deaf Act." In doing so, I am following the wise and able leadership of my colleague from New York, HUGH L. CAREY, chairman of the ad hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped, of the Education and Labor Committee, who first introduced this bill yesterday.

Recent studies, particularly the investigations of programs for the handicapped by the ad hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped, have clearly shown the need for Federal assistance in secondary education for the deaf. Only 8 percent of deaf children as compared with 40 percent of hearing children gain admis-

sion and attend out colleges and universities.

The reason has nothing to do with the innate intelligence or abilities of the children who cannot hear. Rather, the poor educational achievement record of the deaf is the direct result of the poor educational facilities that are available to cope with their special problems. Public high schools are not equipped or staffed to take on this responsibility, and adequate special secondary schools simply do not exist. Thus, only in exceptional cases—where the parents have the financial resources to pay for special training and tutoring, for example—is a deaf child enabled to benefit from higher education opportunities. The human waste involved is tragic.

The bill I have introduced will establish a model secondary school for the deaf to be operated by Gallaudet College in Washington, D.C., for the National Capital area. Gallaudet College is a federally supported college for the deaf and blind created by Congress in 1857. It is well suited to extend its activities to the secondary school level and is the logical place for the location of a school of this nature.

Public support for secondary schools for the deaf is long overdue, and I am hopeful that eventually this principle may be expanded so that similar schools will be set up in other parts of the country.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT IN MAINE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD of the House is now beginning to be quite full with inserts concerning the celebrated Dickey-Lincoln School project in Maine. Some views both pro and con have appeared and, in my opinion, have served the best interest of this House. For we are now, finally, after a year, beginning to get the record straight on this project. If nothing else we are beginning to break through the clouds of confusion, the charges and countercharges, the claims and counterclaims and surely most of us must be coming to the conclusion that my request for one, complete, thorough and accurate study of this project is in order—just as the House determined last year.

A recent editorial in the Portland Press Herald has charged me with assaulting this project only in the interests of protecting the coal industry and workingmen in my district. I do not deny this charge, I welcome it, but in fairness to all of the Members of this House, I feel compelled to point out that this same editorial and newspaper remains strangely silent in pointing out that my distinguished colleagues from that State are doing exactly the same thing—representing the interests of their district.

But the gentlemen from Maine end up, I fear, slightly on the short side of the score of the total ball game. For I find myself in the most fortunate position of being able to represent the best interest of my district as well as in a position to represent the best interests of the entire New England area and the Nation.

Let me present to this House a few figures that more than amply demonstrate the logic, from any point of view except Maine's, of my position:

First. The Dickey-Lincoln School project will eventually cost the taxpayers of the entire Nation $300 million.

Second. It will certainly not benefit the taxpayers from Arizona or Arkansas, Minnesota or Montana, Washington or Wyoming. It will have no national benefits and, therefore, is not in the national interest.

Third. It will not even benefit the New England States because, as the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston has pointed out in a thorough study, it will produce power at 15 to 20 percent higher cost, even with the Federal subsidy, than power that can be produced by private, investor-owned companies spending their own money and not the taxpayers.

Fourth. It will work entirely to the detriment of the coal-producing areas of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and surrounding States because it will substitute high-cost water power source for the lower-cost coal-burning steam-electric plants.

Fifth. The investor-owned electric companies of the New England area are now well into a $1,500 million building program—the largest building program ever undertaken in the region. Six of the so-called Big Eleven Powerloop plants are already under construction, and have been for upward of 5 years totally obviating the argument that they are a response to the Dickey proposal.

Sixth. Three of these eleven plants will be huge, coal-burning stations. It is a most striking coincidence to observe these figures. These three plants will produce 1.4 million kilowatt hours of electricity, some 7,000 hours a year, or a total of 10 billion kilowatt hours of low-cost power. That means an annual consumption of 6 billion pounds of coal starting in the 1968–69 time period. In other terms, it means some 3 million tons of coal, or at present market prices approximately $30 million annually to the coal industry and its workers. Over the decade from 1968 to 1978 that amounts to $300 million.

Look carefully at those facts and figures. If the Dickey project is built it will cost the taxpayers $300 million. If it is not built, it can mean $300 million in revenue—private revenue—going to the industry that can produce a product that produces lower cost power.

Yes, gentlemen I welcome the charge that I am defending an industry in my district. I further welcome any charge that I am at the same time defending the taxpayers of the United States, who will get a higher tax bill, and the electric rate payers of New England who would get nothing but higher electric bills from such a project.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in view of the complaints during the recent airline strike that there had been little give-and-take collective bargaining until the two parties were right at the strike deadline, I think it is significant that a situation in which the collective-bargaining process is working quite effectively has been receiving far less attention.

Thus, few people appear to realize that in the negotiations between the Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO, and the management of Western Electric, a subsidiary of the Bell System, there has been a sustained effort to reach agreement. Obviously, we hope they do reach a settlement without the need to take recourse to strike action. Even if they do not reach agreement, we can at least take satisfaction in knowing that a sincere attempt was made by the union and management to avert the need to strike.

As CWA commented in a recent advertisement, the union wants agreement but realistically must be prepared for the possibility of disagreement. CWA throughout the Nation has earned a well-deserved reputation as a responsible union dedicated to serving both the interests of its members and the communities in which they live.

The same can and should be said of Western Electric and its parent, the Bell System. Both are responsible firms dedicated to serving the interests of their shareholders, their employees and the communities in which they live.

In the present situation, the men and women of CWA have once again demonstrated that, in the best traditions of American labor-management relationships, they want to make collective bargaining work.

In the present situation, the representatives of Western Electric have also once again demonstrated that they, too, strongly desire to reach a settlement through and maintain the integrity of collective bargaining.

Whatever the result, they deserve our commendation for that.

A VISION OF GOD

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the able, dedicated and eloquent pastor of my church, the Reverend H. Floyd Folsom of the Miami Shores Baptist Church of Miami Shores, Fla. The sermons which Dr. Folsom preaches are always able and inspiring but I thought one that he delivered on February 27 of this year under the subject "A Vision of God" was so superior that I asked Reverend Folsom to send me a copy of it so I might put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the edification of my colleagues and all those who read this RECORD and that it might be preserved in the permanent RECORD of the Congress.

I am pleased, therefore, to insert following my remarks this movingly meaningful sermon of Reverend Folsom—"A Vision of God."

A VISION OF GOD

(Preached at Miami Shores Baptist Church, Miami, Fla., on February 27, 1966, by H. Floyd Folsom, Th. D., Pastor)

Text: Isaiah 6: 1–8.

King Louis XIV was dead. At the funeral the great Cathedral was packed with mourners. Atop the golden casket was burning one lone candle, the only light in the vast room. It pierced the darkness to say that the king was alone in his magnificence among men. The court preacher stood to address the assembled great of France. Before ever he said a word he stepped from the pulpit, reached over the casket and snuffed out that one candle. Out of the darkness came just four words: "Only God is great."

More than two thousand years ago Isaiah, the prophet, was also in mourning. Isaiah had loved dearly his king, and when Uzziah died the man of God was enveloped in darkness. Uzziah had been a good king through many years and when, in later life, he was stricken with leprosy and passed under the shadow of death it was this experience that brought Isaiah the man to become Isaiah the prophet. "In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord . . ."

Some of you never look up until you find yourselves down. Some of you never behold the King of Heaven until that which you have made your king on earth is taken from you. In the midst of the forest the blue of the heavens is blotted out until autumn and winter come and the leaves, dead, drop to the ground. Only then can you see the heavens. The lights of the city make it virtually impossible for you to observe the brilliance of the stars. Astronaut Scott Carpenter was a hundred and fifty miles above man's electric maze when he observed: "The sky is black. The stars are brilliant." Uzziah must die in order that Isaiah might see that it is God who ever lives.

What has truly become your God? Is it some king? Some political personage? He, too, will some day die! Is physical beauty your king? Your obsession? It, too, shall one day fade before some leprous disease. Is television your god? Do you give allegiance to it? Bow down before it? Its picture tube will fade forever one day. Is Wall Street your god? Do you bow at its shrine? Its financial structure will one day crumble like the wall which gave the street its name. What has truly become your god? Does it stand between you and a vision of the Living God? Must He continually take away our little kings in order to show us that there is One who does not pass away? "In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord."

There are three things about this vision to which we must give note. It took place *in the Temple;* God was seen *on the throne;* and the living King was *surrounded by worshippers.*

Isaiah's vision of God took place in the Temple. So many of us today have a superficial concept of the person of God because there is such infrequent entering into the Temple of God. America makes the claim to be a godly nation and, compared to many nations of the world, doubtless it is. But on any given worship day in my county eighty per cent of the people are not found in the house of worship.

Many who "holler the loudest" over the absence of Bible reading and prayers in the public schools are not to be found reading the Bible or praying in the designated places of worship on the appointed day of worship! A deaf-mute attended worship regularly. When asked why, he said: "To show which side I'm on." Benjamin Franklin in his "Autobiography" tells of a minister of old England who was ordered to read an edict by a king, bidding the people to return to sports on Sunday.

To the congregation's amazement and horror he did read the royal edict in church—a thing which many clergymen had refused to do. But he followed it with the words: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." And then he added: "Brethren, I have laid before you the commandment of your king and the commandment of your God. I leave it to you to judge which of the two ought rather to be observed." Some, I say, never see God because you never go where God is likely to be seen! It was in the Temple that Isaiah saw the Lord.

A second thing to notice about this vision is that God was ". . . sitting upon a throne . . . high and lifted up." The king of Israel was dead and in a casket; the King of Heaven was alive and sitting upon a throne! The king of earth was buried in the heart of the earth; the King of Heaven was exalted, high and lifted up! The leprous Uzziah's death left Isaiah disappointed, deserted and desolate; the Living Lord filled Him with hope and trust and confidence.

Two cripples entered a church one day;
Crippled, but each in a different way;
One had a body strong and whole
But it sheltered a warped and twisted soul.
The other walked with a halting gait,
But his soul was "tall and fair and straight."

They shared a pew. They shared a book,
But on each face was a different look.
One was alight with hope and joy
And faith that nothing could destroy.
The other joined not in prayer or hymn,
No smile relaxed his features grim.

His neighbor had wronged him; his heart was sore;
He thought of himself, and nothing more.
The words that were read from the Holy Book
Struck deafened ears and a forlorn look.

To one came comfort—his soul was fed;
The other gained nothing from what was said.

Two cripples left the church that day;
Crippled—but each in a different way.

A twisted foot did one body mar,
But the twisted soul was sadder far.

—MILDRED M. NORTH.

"In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord; sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple."

A third characteristic of this experience is found in the worshipping creatures which Isaiah beheld surrounding the throne. "Above him stood the seraphim." Now these creatures are not elsewhere mentioned in Holy Writ. Surely they were angelic beings, and the fact that they ever worshipped Him reminds us of the picture of heaven in the book of the Revelation of John. They are described as having three pair of wings: "And each had six wings: with twain he covered his face . . ." This angelic being, in the presence of Holy God, used two of his feathery apendages to hide his face, two to cover his feet, and the third pair were used for flying. These uses are very suggestive.

The covering of the face suggests the need of reverence in our worship of God. A true worship experience is to be found somewhere between a cold formalism, as is sometimes experienced, and a picnic atmosphere which sometimes prevails. In claiming the "priesthood of all believers"—which means that in Christ all can come into the presence of the Father—we are prone to lose the awesomeness of what it means to be in His presence. One must not lose his reverence in the midst of his confidence! Moses "hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God."

The publican in Christ's parable "would not so much as lift his eyes toward heaven, but smote himself on the breast and cried: 'Lord, be merciful unto me a sinner.'" These angelic beings covered their faces in reverence. A man was being shown over a church house in which he had never been before. He failed to remove his hat. "I hope you don't mind my keeping my hat on?" "I mind? Not at all! It isn't my house!" replied the pastor. I experience an involuntary shudder everytime I hear the term: "The Man upstairs." I cringe everytime I hear the name of God spoken lightly.

I fear for our future whenever I observe parents permitting their children to run in the worship place. This is no place for boys and girls to court one another; it is the place for all of us to court the favor of God. This is not the place to sit and talk to one another; it is the place to sit and talk with the Living Lord. This is not the place to sit and read story books, but to sit and seek THE story in THE Book. This is no place to sit and draw airplanes, but to sit and draw near to Him who paints the western sky. This is no place to chew gum, but to eat the bread and drink the water of life. This is the place of worship. "With twain he covered his face."

In Dr. C. Roy Angell's Book, "Iron Shoes," is the story of another preacher: Dr. Carter Jones of Philadephia told of a time in his pastorate in another town. In the pastorium was a prayer room—a Sky Room, he called it. It was an attic room, used only for prayer and meditation. "One day I came in irritable and fretful, have hurried from one appointment to another. 'I'm going up to the Sky Room,' I said to my wife, 'Don't let anybody interrupt me.' I dragged up the steps, shut the door, and sat down. The only furniture was a chair, a table and a Bible. As I idly turned the leaves, I heard footsteps tapping the stairway outside, then a timid knock. A bit irritated that somebody had gotten by my wife's watchful eye, I opened the door with a frown on my face; and there was my little six year old. She was nervous, because she knew she wasn't supposed to disturb me. 'Daddy,' she said, 'you've been so busy these days that I just haven't had time to love you. I just want to love you a little.' I dropped down on my knees, and she put her arms about me and I put my arms about her, and she kissed me, and tiptoed out of the room. I pushed the door to, without getting off my knees; and I looked to heaven and I said: 'God, I have been so busy going to and fro and up and down, that I have not taken time to love you. I just want to stay here a little bit and talk with you.'"

"Be still," wrote the Psalmist of old, "and know that I am God." "With twain he covered his face"—in reverence! Dr. Carter Jones came out of that Sky Room a different man! And would you notice that Isaiah added to his account of the vision that "The whole earth was full of His glory." God will fill your whole earth for the week to come, if you will fill your eyes with a vision of Him on the worship day.

"With twain he covered his feet." Self-forgetfulness. Humility. True, the nearer we get to God the better we see ourselves, the more clearly we see our unworthiness and the more aware we become of our limitations. But in the Temple we ought consciously to endeavor to forget those matters which claim us throughout the week. Some of you boys are out there right now with minds on the ball and glove! You clerks have your order pads open and you teachers have your books open in your mind's eyes. Some of you housewives, even while you sit in the congregation, must take care lest you in your minds be opening oven door or standing with the mop in hand! You bankers, are you counting your money? You vain women, are you right now examining a dress in a shop window? What are you thinking about? "With twain he covered his feet" in self-forgetfulness. He was in the Temple! He was in the presence of God!

A small boy returned home from a Sunday school which on that day met in the sanctuary in a worship period. He announced proudly to his lazy parents who stayed at home: "I went into the big church this morning." "You didn't go all the way, did you?" anxiously asked his dad. "Sure I did! How can you go just part way into the church?" Well, many of you do! You bring your body in but leave your mind outside. You are physically on the ground, but mentally in orbit! I appeal to you: Cover your feet! Forget yourselves and look on God!

"And with twain he did fly." The third set of wings suggest *service*. No body is really going to behold God and in awe hide his fact and in humility veil his feet without feeling impulses to go forth and serve the King! It is just because of irreverence and self-conceit and idleness that our lives are weak. Vision will be turned into vocation!

A little later the prophet heard the question: "Whom shall I send? Who will go for us?" His answer: "Here am I, Lord, send me." Worship and service. When the Master and His disciples came down from the mountaintop experience of worship they met the man with the afflicted son, and He healed him. Worship and service. When at Bethany the Lord called forth Lazarus, he said: "Loose him, and let him go." And I'm sure that, once loosed, Lazarus went out to serve Him who restored his life. Worship and service! "And with twain he did fly."

William Carey in 1792 England was a shoemaker and a lay-preacher. He preached with a Bible in one hand, a shoemaker's hammer in the other and a map of the world on the wall. At length William Carey realized that he must go to the heathen in India with the gospel. "I will go down into the pit," he said, "if you will hold the ropes." All of us cannot be missionaries, but all of us can hold the ropes. Service must accompany worship.

When she was a young child Princess Juliana of the Netherlands once watched a parade from the palace balcony. "Do all those people belong to me?" she asked her mother. "No, indeed, child," replied Queen Wilhelmina, "We belong to all those people!" God does belong to me; but I belong to God, also. And as I see Him in my worship, I must serve Him in my world. "In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord."

OUTSTANDING SERVICE BY NON-STRUCK AIRLINES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, now that the airline strike has been settled and normal service restored, I feel it is appropriate that we pause for a few moments to acknowledge our debt of gratitude to those who served the country with such distinction during the past 6 weeks.

As one who was dependent upon air travel, I want to express my appreciation to the management and employees of American and the other nonstruck airlines who rendered such efficient and devoted service throughout the period of the strike.

During the past 6 weeks American Airlines flew more people more miles than any airline in history. Instead of the expected workload of approximately 125,000 calls during July, American employees received and handled nearly 350,000 inquiries which required many of their telephone reservation clerks to work 12 hours a day, 7 days a week.

As a traveler on American Airlines during the strike I can testify personally in regard to their courteous and outstanding service and I take this opportunity to commend everyone concerned for an important job well done.

In particular I want to express my deep gratitude to those who manned the service counters at New York's LaGuardia Airport. Their efficiency and congeniality was such that somehow they managed to make every standby feel important. As an ex-standby I want to say thank you to them especially.

EXTENSION AND TRAINING OF THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be speaking today in favor of measures that would greatly assist the mentally retarded and other handicapped children of this country. Certainly the legislation proposed by Mr. CAREY and Mr. FOGARTY will do much to close the gap between the needs for and resources available for training and educating handicapped youth.

There are a number of good reasons for urging the enactment of this legislation. I would like to briefly summarize some of the considerations that demonstrate the need for this bill.

First of all, we must recognize that only 25 percent of the handicapped children in this country are receiving the educational services they need.

Second, the costs of educating and training such children are, by the very nature of the special services required, greater than costs are for "normal" children.

While the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provided badly needed funds to assist State-supported schools for the handicapped, there is still the matter of aiding public and private local schools where there are classes for these children.

There is also an acute shortage of trained personnel to work with the children. The lack of funding for special programs in schools has resulted in far too few people entering this rewarding and important field.

While there has been work done in the development of instructional materials for the handicapped, such efforts have not been comprehensive enough. To be sure, books are available for the blind, but even these are limited in number and in their suitability for the very young. Captioned films for deaf children are an aid. But what kinds and how many aids are designed for the mentally retarded child? Not many, I am afraid.

And finally we find that there is no national policy or direction to the many efforts in this area. Past experience with such programs has shown that in order to focus maximum attention on the problems and to achieve maximum effectiveness in their solution, a coordinated and comprehensive national effort is needed.

The provisions of these proposals, while modest in appropriations, are certainly designed to promote and expand work in all phases of training for the handicapped child. Provision is made for the recruiting and training of greater numbers of educational personnel. Assistance is provided to the States for the establishment of administrative and supervisory units to coordinate existing programs and begin new ones. Exemplary programs—the proving ground of new methods and the stimuli for widespread adoption of those methods—are to be encouraged and funded. I am also happy to see that private corporations and institutions will be encouraged to assist in the development of new educational techniques and equipment. Too often, I think, we overlook the role that industry could be playing in education.

We have here, then, proposals which are comprehensive in scope, yet modest in appropriation. While they may not meet all of our present needs, they provide the machinery with which those needs can be met. For the first time, we have faced the entire problem of education for the handicapped and met it well on all fronts.

COOPERATIVE WORK TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a highly successful summer school program called cooperative work training which was held at the King Educational and Vocational Guidance Center in Chicago located in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois.

This summer program, which terminated August 19, took 230 boys and girls,

14 years of age and older, off the streets of Chicago. It gave them an opportunity to learn, to participate in recreation, and to be gainfully employed. In short, it reached children who had given up and who did not care about the future any more. Cooperative work training helped these discouraged youngsters improve their status and their outlook on life, and dramatically changed "losers" into "winners."

The youngsters who were under 16 took part in the academic and recreational aspects of this program. Those over 16 were assisted in finding part-time jobs, in addition to participating in the other portions of the program. Many of these youngsters will continue their part-time employment after they return to school in the fall. Cooperative work training helped these young people become employable and then took positive action in finding employment for them. This short-term program achieved concrete results and is certainly worthy of continuation next year.

I want to congratulate Mr. Gilbert Benowitz, principal, and Mr. Stanley Vopat, assistant principal, of the King Educational and Vocational Guidance Center, Dr. Arthur R. Lehne, assistant superintendent, Vocational and Practical Arts Department of the Chicago Board of Education, Mrs. Helen J. Evans, director, Bureau of Vocational and Practical Arts Education, Mrs. Lucile Broadwell, director, Division of Vocational Education for Girls, Mr. John W. Craig, project coordinator, and Mr. John Broderick, work study coordinator, whose efforts were instrumental in assuring the success of the cooperative work training program.

I want also to commend the more than 70 private firms and companies which, as cooperating employers, gave jobs to these youngsters. I am proud that the great majority of these firms that gave jobs to the youngsters are located in my congressional district. Education has become a little more meaningful and the door to opportunity has opened a little wider for these youngsters because these companies participated in the cooperative work training program.

And, of course, Dr. Benjamin C. Willis, general superintendent of schools in Chicago, and the principals, coordinators, and district superintendents for the 13 participating schools made an invaluable contribution by the part they played in initiating this exceptional summer program. Their foresight in recognizing the need for such a program made it possible for 230 Chicago youngsters to develop a sense of responsibility to themselves and to their community. As a direct result of cooperative work training, these youngsters have become contributing citizens and assets in our society.

It is my pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief description of the cooperative work training program written by Principal Gilbert Benowitz. The article follows:

KING EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE CENTER, CHICAGO, ILL.

(By Gilbert Benowitz, principal)

Earn money while you learn, play ball and go swimming, train for office work in an air conditioned building, visit museums and art galleries, picnics; all this and more is taking place at the King Educational & Vocational Guidance Center, 2420 West Harrison, during the summer school session for 1966. With federal assistance supplied through the Vocational Education Act of 1963, an effective school work training and academic program is taking place for two hundred and thirty (230) boys and girls. These students, all of whom are over fourteen (14) years of age, were classified as over age and underachieving in their regular schools. They needed to be motivated so that their learning ability would improve. Many of these boys and girls had given up, they were "losers". Providing a beneficial academic recreational school program has created the desire for continued education and has helped the students improve their status and self image.

During the summer, students who are fifteen (15) years old may attend school two hours and work four hours for tax supported agencies. Ninety six (96) students at King have taken advantage of this training program and are working in offices at the Illinois Employment Security, at Cook County Hospital, at the Chicago Public Library, and at other schools in the area. Thirty sixteen year old students are working for industrial organizations as part time, self employed workers. Many of these sixteen year old students are being trained for the printing trades, for clerical work, for restaurant services, for factory and stock helpers, and for grounds maintenance. Western Electric, Sears Roebuck, The Hilton Catering Service, F & M Industries and Goodwill are a few of the large industries where Cooperative Work Students are employed.

Each tax supported agency and industry agrees to provide an on the job trainer who works closely with the trainee during the hours of employment. After working four hours, work study students return to King where a special tutoring program provides beneficial academic classes in reading and arithmetic. If any academic work is needed in the work situation, the school prepares a special tutoring program to help the student become more productive. Fifteen year old students earn approximately forty five ($45.00) dollars per two week work period. Sixteen year old students earn from $1.25 per hour to $1.80 per hour for their part time employment.

An out of school recreational program has been highly successful during the summer program. In this program, King students have the opportunity of participating in a competitive baseball tournament at the Altgeld Park. Both boy and girl teams have been formed in this tournament play. A Red Cross swimming course for boys has been organized for Wednesday afternoons at the Crane Swimming Pool. Girls participate in a recreational fun swim on Tuesday afternoons. Square dancing, tumbling, small group games, kick baseball and tournament basketball are also part of the physical education program.

This summer, King Educational & Vocational Guidance Center has a staff member whose purpose is to work with groups of neighborhood teen boys. This community Representative has been a major force in the area around King for the past four weeks. He has organized six groups of boys, ranging in age from fourteen to eighteen, into baseball and basketball teams. These groups represent the Rockwell Gardens, boys on 19th and Albany, boys who live near the Altgeld Playground and the youngsters on Harrison and Western. Since the start of summer school, this Community Representative has been out on the street seeking out youth groups and trying to get these groups interested in tournament play. The participation by these out of school boys has been encouraging and indicates that this type of activity is needed in this area.

A third activity which has been highly successful during this summer has been a bi-weekly trip by all students for cultural enrichment. School and group tours have been taken to middle class neighborhoods, to the Chicago Public Library, to the Museum of Science and Industry, as well as the Field Museum, Planetarium, and Aquarium, O'Hare Field, The Theatre on the Lake, Art Institute, Lincoln Park Zoo, the Concerts and the movies at the Field Museum, the Armory, the Sun-Times Building have all been visited. These trips, movies, concerts, outings and educational tours provide first hand experience with the cultural richness of Chicago.

The academic theme of the King Educational & Vocational Guidance Center Summer School has been, "Heroes of Western Civilization." This theme has been explored in depth so that students could identify these heroes as outstanding personalities of Western Culture. Each classroom has developed this theme around people in various walks of life. Athletic heroes, scientific heroes, political heroes, heroes of literature, etc. Each student has also been encouraged to make a notebook in which his summer work is recorded.

Possibly the outstanding part of this summer school is the individual attention which each student receives. Reading progress is considered of first importance in planning the entire program. The school's language laboratory, containing tachistiscope, language masters, and controlled reader is second in importance. Through ESEA funds a thermofax, tape recorder, opaque projector, and an overhead projector were added to the equipment in this room.

Selective SRA Newspaper, Phonics, and Library Materials are used successfully to upgrade students reading. Many reading games and manipulative devices of all sorts are also used as an integral part of the reading and arithmetic instructional program. Severely disabled readers are programmed as students to be individually tutored. These one-to-one tutoring sessions have provided the needed incentive for reading diagnoses and improvement.

On August 17, a school program is being planned to take place in the Cermack Woods. Nature hikes, competitive sports events, games, food preparation, and recognition of students will take place at that time. This event will be the culminating activity of summer school.

Employers and interested parents will be invited to take part in this event where recognition for merit will be given to each employer and to the students who have participated in the various parts of the summer school program.

EDUCATION IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend the public and parochial school systems and the colleges and universities in the Metropolitan New Orleans area, and their teachers and administrative staffers, for their dedicated, unselfish good works to unfold greater educational and cultural horizons for the children of my area, particularly the underprivileged young

children who will enter school for the first time this fall.

Through such programs as Operation Headstart, the public, parochial, and private schools in the New Orleans area—with the aid of volunteer workers and professional staffers of Total Community Action Inc. of New Orleans and social and public welfare agencies—have devoted their efforts this summer to preparing children for entry into grammar school or into college.

Among the summer programs are remedial, enrichment, recreation, providing academic and nonacademic courses to young children from low-income areas at 33 elementary and 14 secondary schools through a Federal grant of $2.5 million; summer enrichment for mentally retarded children in which 161 youngsters in 4 schools participated; Project Genesis in which 650 children at 4 schools were given courses in the arts, music, ceramics, languages, and theater, again through a total of $143,956 in Federal funds; Operation Headstart in which more than 3,000 children took part in New Orleans alone at 47 schools in the city, and did so with the help of $495,514 in Federal funds; SCORE, conducted by the Archdiocese of New Orleans for children of all faiths at 12 schools with the aid of $46,000 in Federal funds; Upward Bound programs for more than 470 boys and girls, who will be high school seniors this year, at 3 New Orleans universities: Dillard, Xavier, and Loyola, and others.

Mr. Speaker, a fine educational leader in our area, Dr. Carl J. Dolce, superintendent of Orleans Parish public schools, recently stated that the total cost of these summer programs for the education of our children was more than $5 million:

Said Dr. Dolce:

> This is our most significant summer in terms of education, these programs could not exist without federal funds.

Dr. Dolce's statement, Mr. Speaker, is a recognition of the significant and landmark legislation in the field of education which the 88th and 89th Congresses have enacted, and I know the Members of this House and of the Senate are proud of the roles they had in enacting the most far-reaching education legislation in the history of the United States.

The Higher Education Acts of 1963 and 1965; the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; the Vocational Education Act of 1963; the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and the subsequent amendments to expand this significant act, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 and its amendments in 1965, the Mental Retardation Facilities and the Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, Training Teachers for the Handicapped of 1965, the Nurse Training Act of 1964, National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities of 1965, the National Defense Education Act amendments of 1964, Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, and other important education programs all are making their impact felt in our country for the benefit of all the citizens of this great Nation of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend to my colleagues four recent newspaper articles on these summer education programs in the New Orleans area which were published in the Times-Picayune, the New Orleans States-Item, and the Clarion-Herald, the official newspaper of the Archdiocese of New Orleans. These articles appeared this month in these newspapers in my city, and I am happy to insert in the RECORD. The articles follow:

[From the Times-Picayune, Aug. 12, 1966]

PROJECT HEAD START TO END—ESTIMATED 5,000 TAKE PART IN PROGRAM

Project Head Start classes end Friday for 3,500 pre-school children following eight weeks of intensive activity in 47 public schools.

The program, which began June 20, was conducted by New Orleans Parish School Board, said this year's program brought "a possibilities of the four and five-year-old children with learning, cultural and other special experiences designed to give them a "head start" when they begin formal schooling this fall.

Dr. Julianna Boudreaux, director of kindergarten-primary education for the School Board said this year's program brought "a marvelous teacher and community wide response."

FIVE THOUSAND INVOLVED

"We estimate that nearly 5,000 citizens—teachers, volunteers, teacher aides, social workers and others—were directly involved in the program and we are eternally grateful for their splendid cooperation and support," she said.

Dr. Boudreaux said this year there was a much larger social services program—visits to homes of parents whose children were enrolled. There also was more direct contact with families, more psychological screening and parent involvement.

She said the medical and dental examination phases of the program were the most extensive ever conducted in New Orleans. Medical examinations were administered to the children at the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital and the dental program was conducted by an advisory committee of representatives of organized dentistry.

In this program, portable dental units were used in classrooms for the first time to aid dentists in cleaning teeth and administering fluoride treatment.

PROBLEM SCREENING

During the final weeks of the program, the children received screening for special problems and strengths in intellectual functioning.

Parents were also involved through social workers who encouraged their interest in the children's achievements. They participated by attending parent education classes and related home education.

The New Orleans program was open to children of lower income areas of the city without regard to race, creed or national origin and was financed by an Office of Economic Opportunity grant of $495,514 to the School Board and Total Community Action Inc., the local antipoverty coordinating agency.

Dr. Boudreaux said a Head Start policy advisory committee composed of parents of youngsters in the program and community leaders will meet Friday afternoon to discuss various aspects of the program.

[From the New Orleans States Item, Aug. 20, 1966]

FEDERAL FUNDS POUR IN: SUMMER EDUCATION HITS NEW RECORD IN ACTIVITY

(By Allan Katz)

An unprecedent wave of education this summer swept up more than 14,000 children in the New Orleans area and carried them to the threshold of a new school year.

Total cost of the previously unmatched vacation-time effort to increase children's potential for learning was more than $5 million, most of it in federal funds.

The programs ranged from Operation Head Start for 4- and 5-year-olds to Upward Bound programs at three local universities for 11th graders from low-income homes who show promise of being college material.

Principal forces behind the surge for education were the Orleans Parish School Board, Total Community Action Inc., which is the local anti-poverty agency; the Archdiocese of New Orleans, and Loyola, Dillard and Xavier Universities.

Dr. Carl J. Dolce, superintendent of Orleans Parish public schools, calls it "our most significant summer here in terms of education."

He says the massive, coordinated programs represent a sharp deviation from often haphazard summer school programs aimed chiefly at youngsters who flunked during the regular year. Dr. Dolce said the difference is federal funds.

"These programs could not exist without the federal funds," says Dr. Dolce.

He points out the programs are not a rehash of regular material but are largely enrichment programs aimed at increasing youngsters' ability to learn.

In addition to the educational programs were the Orleans Parish School Board adult program which attracted 1,700 persons, and jampacked recreation programs run by the New Orleans Recreation Department and Total Community Action.

Also taking part were members of the New Orleans Police Department who addressed a number of Head Start classes.

A thumbnail sketch of some of the summer programs:

A data processing course conducted at two public schools and aimed at helping high school students from low-income areas to gain an understanding of basic functions of data processing and practical business problems. About 100 students took part in the program financed by a $7,797 grant.

Remedial-Enrichment-Recreation, known as RER, offered academic and non-academic courses to children from low-income areas at 33 elementary and 14 secondary schools. More than 8,500 participated in the $2.5 million program made possible by a federal grant.

Summer Enrichment for Mentally Retarded attracted 161 youngsters to four schools. The program offered retarded children new experiences through special trips and a chance to learn through use of the newest visual aids.

English for Native Spanish-Speaking Children was financed by a $48,242 federal grant and was aimed at 213 children, many of them youngsters of Cuban refugees. The program, carried on in six schools, was designed to relieve the problems faced by the youngsters switching to U.S. schools.

Project Genesis involved 650 children at four schools and cost $143,956 in federal funds. Courses were offered to students from public and non-public schools in the arts, music, ceramics, languages and theater. The program was culminated by a Festival of the Arts held at the different schools.

Operation Headstart is the oldest of the upgrading programs and this year enrolled 3,111 4- and 5-year-olds. Cost was $495,514 in federal funds and included 47 schools. Children from low-income areas were prepared to enter school and also were given medical and dental examinations.

SCORE, conducted by the Archdiocese of New Orleans for children of all faiths at 12 schools. More than 300 youngsters took part in the basic reading language program that cost $46,000 in federal funds.

Upward Bound programs attracted more than 470 boys and girls who will be seniors in high school this year to summer programs at Dillard, Xavier and Loyola. The three programs together cost more than $550,000. Stressed were English, mathematics, and communication—subjects which students beginning college traditionally find hard to master and areas where children from low-income backgrounds are at a particular disadvantage.

The summer programs were carried on in the midst of plenty with small classes and an abundance of the latest teaching aids and learning machines.

A recent visitor jokingly told Dr. Dolce students and teachers would be spoiled when they returned in the fall to crowed classrooms and he replied:

"That's wonderful. We want our students and teachers to be dissatisfied with less than maximum educational conditions.

"This summer gave us a chance to show what we can do with small classes, new equipment and adequate funds.

"The educational programs staged this summer in New Orleans, and to be staged in the summers ahead, will have a far-reaching beneficial effect on our community."

[From the Clarion-Herald, Aug. 18, 1966]

HEAD START TOWARD HEALTH

(By Newell Schindler)

A child with teeth that ache constantly, eyes that don't see properly, ears that hear only garbled sounds starts school with a hand tied behind his back. Thus health care of pre-school children is one phase of the three-pronged effort waged by Operation Head Start as it prepares four- and five-year-olds for entrance into schools. Here are some startling facts about the health of deprived New Orleans children who have begun to get care this summer under the $700,000 Operation Head Start program in which 40 dentists, 20 doctors, and 13 nurses have participated this summer or will participate in during the follow-up health care before the end of the year.

Seeing a classroom full of children brushing their teeth in unison may strike the viewer at first glance as being amusing.

But an analysis of the necessity for such a drill—the fact that many four- and five-year-old children in New Orleans have never had a toothbrush—is cause for more serious thought.

The lack of knowledge on the part of the children and their parents about routine dental care is just one of the crucial health handicaps faced by children caught in the stifling clutches of poverty.

Medical test findings conducted this summer under Operation Head Start, an anti-poverty program administered in New Orleans by Total Community Action, would startle those not directly involved with the poor in the war on poverty. For example:

1. Abscesses in some four- and five-year-olds have reached such a state that the children must have all their teeth extracted.

2. Dentists said they were amazed that some children with advanced tooth decay could chew at all. The pain just in chewing food must be excruciating, they said.

3. At one school, 137 of 183 children need follow-up dental care. And in another group, 32 of 37 had an average of 10 cavities each and needed further dental attention.

4. Blood test reports of 797 children indicate that 350 of them—approximately 45 per cent—were suffering from malnutrition or possible anemia. This results both from lack of funds for food and lack of knowledge in how to prepare a nutritious diet on a limited budget.

Diets for the poor mean maybe Coke and candy for breakfast, noodles and Kool Aid for supper, and beans much more than just once a week.

Because of the obvious lack of a proper diet, the daily meal allotment for children in Operation Head Start this summer was increased from 31 cents to 50 cents per day per child. Each child in the program was given one meal daily while at school.

As an outgrowth of the situation, two nutrition experts connected with the Tulane university school of medicine are making a study of local malnutrition problems.

The need for extensive adult education in this area is evident.

Sight and hearing defects, while not so prevalent as tooth problems, are present among a significant percentage of the 3,300 children in the eight-week Operation Head Start program.

Ten to 15 per cent of them need further evaluation of possible vision defects. The same percentage is true for hearing.

Loss of vision in one eye can result from eye muscle imbalance, which is not too uncommon among young children. This muscle imbalance causes a child to use one eye, leaving the other idle—and an idle eye will not develop.

This is a condition which should be—and often can be—corrected in the early years if a person is to enjoy the benefits of full vision. But the poor who cannot afford the tests suffer permanent eye injury for lack of attention.

Hearing ailments are sometimes found to be impacted ears, a situation which can usually be corrected by a visit to a doctor's office.

A child examined under the Operation Head Start program, for example, was found to be nearly deaf, unbeknown to his family. As one member of a large family, it was assumed that he was just the quiet one with the withdrawn personality.

Innumerable other physical defects go undetected among the poor because a child sees a doctor only in the case of an emergency.

Among the untreated child diseases is impetigo—Indian fire—which is easily treated, but if left unattended can develop into serious kidney conditions. The nurses found that many parents shrug off impetigo as being infected mosquito bites.

An official of Total Community action said that medical findings in Operation Head Start have served to emphasize the need for comprehensive medical facilities to treat the poorer children of the community.

New Orleans is one of the nation's great health centers and if a poor child has something like a heart condition which can be corrected through surgery, his chances of being cared for are excellent.

But there are no free care programs in the community, for example, for the child who needs extensive dental care, hearing aids, or eye glasses, said Mrs. J. B. Hickey, assistant supervisor for health services in the Head Start program.

Through Operation Head Start and with the help of top medical and dental people in the community, a program has been set up to take advantage of the fine medical facilities in New Orleans and provide follow-up care for those children in the program who have serious defects. Such attention will be given during the next several months.

But such care is for only a small percentage of 3,300 children in an area with a population of one million and with a high proportion of poor people. Tens of thousands of other youngsters in New Orleans and surrounding communities are not among those reached by Operation Head Start.

Many of these have fallen into a pattern of school failure because some physical defect which could have been corrected in the formative years has gone undetected and has impaired the learning process.

They offer society a potential welfare burden rather than an educated member of a community ready to contribute something to society.

[From the Clarion-Herald, Aug. 18, 1966]

PROJECT GENESIS: AWAKENING CREATIVITY

(By Florence Herman)

A classroom without textbooks? C'est impossible!

But this is exactly the approach being taken by a new project of the Orleans Parish School board called "Genesis of a Vibrant Cultural Program." An eight-week program aimed at cultural enrichment of the average school-age child from fourth through 11th grades, Project Genesis is using the most modern and innovative equipment to pursue its goals.

Courses in music and art appreciation, individual instruction in instrumental and vocal music, in-depth courses in various art media, culture and conversation in Spanish and French are offered enrollees.

Depending upon the course the student chooses, he can learn theater arts in depth, enamelware, printmaking, or ceramics. Included with the art courses is one in art appreciation.

With the choice of a music course, the students learn to play one of a wide range of instruments, and participate in concerts given at the end of the study. If enrolled in a vocal course, depending upon age and group, the student can take part in an operetta, a vocal music performance, or a choral concert.

Classes for project Genesis are held five days a week in the mornings from 9 a.m. to noon. Four centers are being operated, at McDonogh senior high school, and Wright, Karr and Gregory junior high schools. There are 650 children enrolled in the pilot program this summer, which is funded by a federal grant of $147,781 under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education act of 1965.

Extensive use has been made of local resources by project directors. Delgado Art museum, Gallery Circle theater and Young Audiences, Inc., are all intimately involved in the project, with extensive use being made of their facilities and personnel.

The program is aimed at the average kid-next-door, who attends either public, parochial, or private school. During the course of a school year, in-depth music and art appreciation courses are not offered, and neither is an in-depth study of any particular type of art. A project such as Genesis allows the kids to pursue a particular course of study intensively for eight weeks.

The languages, as are standardly taught throughout the school year, cover a specified amount of ground in a specified time, with little creativity involved. The approach used by Project Genesis to language arts is conversation and culture. Students do not use textbooks, paper, or pencil. Extensive use of films and tapes gives the children a glimpse of culture of the country which they are studying and teaches only conversation, rather than grammar or syntax. The feeling behind this approach is that the children will have a better understanding of the customs and ideas of the country and will be more inclined to study the language further during the regular school year.

Numerous field trips were planned by project directors. Delgado Art museum has been visited by all the enrollees, and while there they were lectured on the different types and periods of art on display. Included also were trips to private galleries.

Gallery Circle theater, in cooperation with Project Genesis, has spent eight weeks this summer staging "The Glass Menagerie." Students enrolled in theater art courses have spent much time at the theater, watching the play being put together from the beginning on. They were allowed to attend rehearsals and asked numerous questions on everything they saw being done. Object of this was to let the Gallery project serve as a model for the productions they will stage

during the "Festival of Arts," the finale of the summer program.

The week of Aug. 13 through 18 has seen the culmination of the eight weeks of work done by the students. Concerts and plays are being performed at the centers to show the results of the work, and an art display will be put on Aug. 18 at the McDonogh center.

Friday, Aug. 12, saw the staging of a concert put on by the beginners, many of whom eight weeks ago did not know the first thing about violins, clarinets, or trumpets. A choral concert and vocal music performance were put on Aug. 15 at the McDonogh center; and dramatic performances Aug. 16 at the Wright center and Aug. 17 at the Karr center.

Still to be held are a vocal music performance at the Gregory center Aug. 18 and a dramatic performance of selections from "The World We Live in" at the McDonogh center the same evening.

Enthusiasm has run high throughout the entire project, with some of the children making parents rearrange vacation trips so as not to miss any classes. With the apparent success of this year's pilot program, Project Genesis will most probably be slated for renewal in 1967.

THE ATOM HAS COME OF AGE

Mr. PATTEN. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I agree wtih our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], who on Monday of this week declared before this body that the atom has come of age.

I take great comfort in the fact that the new and awesome power and potentialities of the atom have been harnessed for the advancement and enrichment of the human race. Particularly do I take comfort from the fact that men, our scientists, have found constructive use for a force originally conceived for destructive purposes.

The force of the atom was early unleashed in a spectacular demonstration of death and destruction. Today, that same force lights and warms millions of homes, saves untold numbers of lives, contributes to our industrial might, and serves in many other ways.

The atom has come of age and man, it seems, has rewarded the faith of his Maker by seeking to put it to creative and humane purposes.

On this point I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. I sincerely hope that the potential for good of the atom is only beginning to be revealed to us. And, I hope that this revelation will unfold swiftly, in order that we may reap its full benefits soon.

It pleases me that I can open this statement on a note of agreement with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. However, agreement must end here for his recent statement calculated to discredit the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project was, in all other respects, grossly inaccurate and misleading.

I disagree with his suggestion that hydroelectric powerplants are obsolete, and I most emphatically disagree with his appraisal of the merits of the Dickey-Lincoln School project which has been approved by this Congress and is to be constructed in Maine.

I feel that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is not familiar with the voluminous testimony which has been presented in support of the Dickey project. The arguments he offers have been heard before, and totally discredited. For reasons that only he knows, he has seen fit to peddle the wares of the avowed enemies of the Dickey project; the private utilities of New England and others who have no profit to make from inexpensive hydroelectric power.

I would remind my colleagues, including the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], that the big 11 power loop, which he visualizes as the answer to New England's prayers for reasonable electric rates, is itself a product of Dickey and public power.

No word was ever heard of private utility plans to rescue New England consumers from usurious electric rates until the impending authorization of the Dickey project by Congress became a clear possibility. Once announced, the big 11 power loop was hopefully endowed by its worried creaters with powers which technology cannot in fact support.

The big 11 power loop, will in time, enable the New England private utilities to generate power less expensively and to make more money. As there was no thought of a giant power loop before the advent of Dickey, there is little assurance of its completion should Dickey be scuttled. And there is no assurance whatsoever that construction of the big 11 will significantly decrease power costs because the private utilities have consistently refused to predict future costs to consumers.

We know that the New England utilities can produce power at a cost to themselves much lower than at present. This could have been done 20 years ago but because competition did not force them to do so, they did nothing.

With the advent of public power in their area, they must take steps to become competitive, and as a result consumers will at long last find hope for relief.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, permit me now to comment upon some specific allegations made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. He claims that nuclear plants and pumped storage can produce power more cheaply than the Dickey project. The fact is that Dickey-Lincoln School peaking power can be marketed from the proposed 345,000-volt transmission which is included in its cost figure at a price of $14.60 per kilowatt and 2.6 mills for energy. The combined nuclear energy and pumped storage plants of the big 11 power loop would have to market their peaking power at $17.40 per kilowatt and 2.6 mills for energy. These figures have been established by the Federal Power Commission and were adjusted to include transmission, operational costs, and maintenance expense.

The reason why Dickey costs are so favorable is that this project will take advantage of an abundant supply of cost-free water. A pumped-storage plant is designed for use where water is not abundant and is designed to reuse water. Pumping water uphill in order to reuse it is expensive.

Nuclear plants are still not competitive with efficient hydroplants. None of the nuclear plants now in operation have ever operated consistently or efficiently as baseload plants, and it is only by operating at high rates of output over long periods of time that truly low-cost performance can be realized.

The charge that hydropower is obsolete is completely absurd. Private utilities are building, and applying for licenses to build, conventional hydroelectric plants on sites which offer an abundance of water as does the Dickey-Lincoln School project site.

The two statements offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] in support of his views are both interesting and amusing. A thoughtful reading of the article from Barron's is especially recommended as revealing the motives of interests alined against the completion of the Dickey project.

The statement of William Webster, chairman and chief executive of the New England electric system is amusing. It is this gentleman, so positive and confident in the statement quoted by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], who went blank when asked by a committee of Congress a year ago how much New England consumers would have to pay for electric power when the big 11 power loop went into operation.

Mr. Speaker, the Dickey project is New England's only real hope for relief from the highest power rates in the Nation. The Dickey project is the only real hope for a dramatic advance in the industrial progress of my State.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has said that power to be produced by the Dickey-Lincoln School project in northern Maine will find its only market 400 miles away in the Boston area. I view the prospects differently and hope that by the time it is completed Maine's needs will be such that there will be no Dickey power to export.

Maine is known throughout the Nation as a vacationland. For many Maine people, forced vacations due to unemployment have been frequent and lengthy. I view the Dickey project as a means to expand industralization and job opportunities.

It is my hope and purpose that Maine should become a "vacationland" for all its citizens as well as a vacationland for people everywhere who seek charm and peace and rest on their annual holiday.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in support of this project and I ask them to guard against the false arguments that are being leveled against it.

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article on financing higher education deserves wide consideration. It was written by one of the outstanding young educational leaders in the Nation.

The southern regional education board is supported by the Southeastern States and is a pioneering effort to raise the level of educational opportunity for all who reside in the region.

The article follows:

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION

(By Winfred L. Godwin, director, southern regional education board)

"The fact that they won't take Federal aid appealed to us," explained the husband and wife who recently gave a small church-related Southern college the largest financial gift in the history of the school. It may be appealing to some, but it is decidedly at odds with what is happening and with what most people obviously consider appropriate.

Last year, Federal money for primary, secondary and higher education came into the South to the tune of one billion dollars plus. The South's share of the some $3 billion Federal total exceeded by $82 million the amount which distribution in proportion to population would have brought the region.

Private support for education is desirable, and gifts to colleges and universities are being encouraged, but it is unrealistic to suppose that our nation's educational programs will develop without Federal assistance.

National interest in the quality and availability of education is so fundamental that financial assistance from the national government has been inevitable; any concern must lie with the questions of scope, purpose and form of such assistance.

Higher education in the United States is a $10 billion annual operation. Our public colleges and universities rely on tuition, state and Federal funds, and private gifts to meet their budgets, while operating expenses for the private institutions come from tuition, the Federal government and private benefactors. Approximately twice as many Federal dollars go to public institutions as to the private ones.

The Federal funds for higher education go mainly for research, facilities and equipment, student aid, institutional grants such as National Science Foundation grants, and fellowships or training grants. The largest allocations are for research and facilities and equipment, with fellowships and other student support receiving somewhat less.

The two major functions of higher education, research and instruction, are both growing enormously. But the proportion of effort devoted to research is constantly increasing, largely because of demands originating from government activity. The Federal government has accordingly accepted responsibility for paying the bulk of the research bill, with the largest part of Federal funds for education designated for research.

Over the past ten years as costs have risen, the Federal government's share of support has been increasing. Although state governments and private benefactors continue to give increasing amounts for education, the percentage of Federal support gets larger each year.

In higher educational instructional support, the share shouldered by the student has increased significantly, while the share of all other support categories has declined, a situation financially handicapping many able students but for loans and scholarships, the largest part of which again comes from the Federal government.

While some people continue to express a strong and thoughtful conviction that the Federal government should not assume a major responsibility in education, the facts are that without Federal assistance our colleges and universities could never keep pace with the growing demands being made of them. Federal obligations to higher education for fiscal year 1967 will total some $4 billion, exclusive of loan funds.

The very magnitude of Federal support poses problems of its own. Forty-three separate Federal agencies administer programs affecting education, almost all of them operating in the field of higher education.

Categories and conditions of aid have been established to insure that Federal funds are spent in an efficient manner, but it is the responsibility of education officials to be aware of and to make the best use of the many types of assistance offered.

There is national concern that specific needs of higher education be met—and acts relating to facility construction, graduate education, faculty salaries, libraries, laboratories, research projects and student aid all reflect the response of Congress to pressing national needs.

The Federal government has moved beyond offering sporadic financial aid to taking an active, constructive part in improving American education.

HUAC HEARINGS AID TO THE ENEMY?

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, last week on the unhappy occasion of the violent ejection of counsel and witnesses from the hearing chamber of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I rose on the floor of the House in protest. I stated that these events which were depicted on the front pages of newspapers around the world, by AP Wirephoto, could only demean us and our cherished institutions at home and abroad; could only cause satisfaction to the tiny extremes in our society—the minute hard core of Communists on the left and the John Birchers on the right.

Today's syndicated column by Marquis Childs brilliantly completes this picture—the outlines of which I etched—in a sober and thoughtful commentary, which I am sure reflects the frustration and resentment of many Members of both House and Senate, at the futile, pointless, and destructive conduct of the affairs of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Childs' article follows:

HUAC HEARINGS: AID TO THE ENEMY?

(By Marquis Childs)

In assessing the damage done by the House Un-American Activities Committee the effect of that wrestling match on the foreign audience ranks high. Those televised scenes of witnesses and attorneys being dragged from the hearing room are even now being shown in Peking and North Vietnam.

In the propaganda drive to hold the North Vietnamese in the war they are offered as evidence that the brutal hirelings of imperialism will go to any length to suppress the true representatives of the American people. In this propaganda exercise these representatives being trundled off of jail speak for a majority of all Americans.

That is a measure of the harm the hearings have done. They give a tiny splinter of peaceniks—by their own admission not more than 5000 in the whole country—an opening for worldwide exposure and martydom. Before that opening their attempt to dramatize their opposition to the war had fallen off almost to zero.

Whether the masters at the top in Hanoi and Peking believe their own propaganda no one can say. Shut away in their airtight ideological prison they seem to have an infinite capacity for self-deception. But, belief or merely cynical propaganda, the uproar in the committee room was a godsend to the Communists bent on fighting the war in Vietnam to the bitter end. See, they are saying, here you have it—only force holds free Americans from revolting against the military and the capitalists waging a war of aggression against the Vietnamese people.

Underscoring the damage is the fact that active opposition to President Johnson's policy in Vietnam has, with the exception of the peaceniks, all but subsided. Sen. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, the most articulate of the congressional critics, in an interview the other day said in effect that opposition was futile since the Congress was more warlike than the President. He was saying to Hanoi that the Johnson Administration means to go through with the war no matter what the cost in escalation.

Aside from the Communist capitals, the damage elsewhere in the world and here at home cannot be discounted. The scenes of disorder and violence will have a powerful impact in Western Europe where the long-drawn-out tragedy of the war is equated by critics with a quality of recklessness and savagery in the American temperament. The fact that the disorder was begun by the witnesses is irrelevant for the foreign audience, since their martyrdom in being brought before the committee in the first place is established by the past record of what appears in European eyes to be a sinister inquisitorial body with no objective other than to harass anyone whose views are to the left of center.

It may be that past experience with the committee's wild divagations has blunted the effect at home. What, they're at it again? This cannot, however, be taken for granted. Despite the disclaimer of the acting chairman, Rep. JOE POOL of Texas, that there was no intention to deny the right of dissent the line between intellectual criticism of Vietnam policy and acts such as trying to stop a troop train will be blurred.

In a climate of concern as the consequences of the war bite deeper and deeper with the number of American troops close to the 300,000 mark the emotions generated in the hearing room can be infectious. The short way with dissenters—bounce them out and put them in jail—that was the lesson of the hearings shown on television throughout the Nation.

As for the cast of characters the most vengeful and satirical film-maker could not have improved on it. JOE POOL looks like an Alabama sheriff ready at the drop of a bull whip to throw his deputies around the courthouse. He is said to be delighted by the whole affair since it cast him in the role of Communist destroyer and thereby put

his right-wing Republican opponent in Dallas in the shade. Such exposure on television was a boon that couldn't have been bought with all the campaign funds in Texas.

The young peaceniks were cast with equal verisimilitude. They were brash, rude, obstreperous, bent on causing as much trouble as possible given a golden opportunity to discredit Congress and the democratic process. That they were given the opportunity is the saddest commentary of all.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, August 24, 1966, and balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. SCHISLER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. DELANEY), for Wednesday, August 24, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PICKLE, for 1 hour, on Thursday, August 25, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON), for 1 hour, on August 29; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FUQUA (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 10 minutes, on Thursday, August 25, 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:

Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) to extend his remarks during general debate on H.R. 15963 in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. PIRNIE.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. QUIE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WATTS.

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. FASCELL.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3158. An act to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3711. An act to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 14921. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 23, 1966, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8760. An act to amend the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1961 (33 U.S.C. 1001–1015), to implement the provisions of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 25, 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:

2669. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential reductions in cost of automotive travel by Federal employees where use of Government-owned vehicles is feasible; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2670. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2671. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Public Law 8–136 enacted by the Eighth Guam Legislature, pursuant to the provisions of section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2672. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an application for a loan by the North Extension Canal Co., of Grace, Idaho, pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 1044, as amended, 71 Stat. 48; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2673. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an application for a loan by the North Poudre Irrigation Co., of Wellington, Colo., pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 1044, as amended, 71 Stat. 48; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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. PATMAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 3688. An act to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction (Rept. No. 1868). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on conference. Conference report on S. 3700. An act to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (Rept. No. 1869). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 3510. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of a Connecticut River and National Recreation Area, in the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12536. A bill to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, relating to the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services; with amendment (Rept. No. 1871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1035. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that bagpipes and parts thereof shall be admitted free of duty; with amendment (Rept. No. 1872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 16813. A bill to transfer to the Atomic Energy Commission complete administrative control of approximately 78 acres of public domain land located in the Otowi section near Los Alamos County (Rept. No. 1873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 17119. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to be assigned or detailed to the Environmental Science Services Administration, Department of Commerce (Rept. No. 1874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 976. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11555, a bill to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande River in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico (Rept. No. 1875). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 977. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11880, a bill to authorize conclusion of an agreement with Mexico

for joint measures for solution of the lower Rio Grande salinity problem (Rept. 1876). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolutions 979. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12723, a bill to amend chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, to provide medical treatment and services, and drugs and medicines to those veterans receiving additional pension under old law pension provisions based on need for regular aid and attendance (Rept. No. 1877). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 979. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14604, a bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to remodel the existing structures of the U.S. Botanic Garden for use as a visitors' center (Rept. No. 1878). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 980. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16330, a bill to provide for extension and expansion of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1879). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 981. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16367, a bill to extend the benefits of the war orphans' educational assistance program to the children of those veterans of the Philippines Commonwealth Army who died or have become permanently and totally disabled by reason of their service during World War II, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1880). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 982. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16559, a bill to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to authorize the establishment and operation of sea grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education and research in the various fields relating to the development of marine resources, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1881). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 983. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 1217, joint resolution to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks (Rept. No. 1882). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 984. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16574, a bill to amend the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1883). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1884). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 16774. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain existing rules relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay (Rept. No. 1885). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 15941. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1886). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 3105. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1887). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 17211. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 17212. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt servicemen from the excise tax on transportation by air; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 17213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt servicemen from the excise tax on transportation by air; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 17214. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for cost-of-living increases on the annuities and pensions (and lump-sum payments) which are payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 17215. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 17216. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 17217. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 17218. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder, to strengthen the reserves of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and to eliminate gradually the contingent liability of the Treasury to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 17219. A bill requiring the disclosure of financial interests of Members, officers, and certain employees of the House of Representatives and prohibiting financial transactions with groups seeking to influence legislation or to do business with the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 17220. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 17221. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder, and to provide that any such increase shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility for pension under title 38 of the United States Code (veterans' benefits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 17222. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 17223. A bill to authorize the establishment and operation by Gallaudet College of a model secondary school for the deaf to serve the National Capital region; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 17224. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 17225. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 17226. A bill to modify the navigation project on the upper Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 17227. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 17228. A bill to provide that certain expenses incurred in connection with an urban renewal project in Camden, N.J., shall be eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 17229. A bill to authorize the transfer of vessels of the Office of Economic Opportunity by the Secretary of Commerce for educational purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 17230. A bill to authorize the establishment and operation by Gallaudet College of a model secondary school for the deaf to serve the National Capital region; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 17231. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 17232. A bill to amend section 523(b), chapter 15, of title 38, United States Code, to enable certain permanently and totally disabled veterans to receive the full rate of disability compensation found payable for their wartime service-connected disabilities, and also a proportionate amount of disability pension under a specified formula; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17233. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefits payments shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17234. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17235. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the payment of additional pensions to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and to widows of such veterans, to raise the income limits with respect to the payment of such pensions, to increase by 10 percent the pension payable to such veterans who served overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 17236. A bill to establish a National Commission on Public Management, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SKUBITZ (by request):

H.R. 17237. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Iowa Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 17238. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 17239. A bill to limit contests of elections of Members of the House of Representatives to contents brought by duly qualified candidates whose names appear on the official ballots; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 17240. A bill to authorize the establishment and operation by Gallaudet College of a model secondary school for the deaf to serve the National Capital region; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 17241. A bill to make certain expenditures of the city of New Orleans, La., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 17242. A bill to provide that certain expenditures made by the city of New Orleans, La., shall be eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 17243. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 17244. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 17245. A bill to permit the city of Oakland, Calif., to count certain land acquisition costs as part of the development cost of a proposed facility for purposes of the neighborhood facility grant program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 17246. A bill to provide that expenditures made in connection with the construction of a city hall in Allentown, Pa., may be counted as local grants-in-aid toward federally assisted urban renewal projects in Allentown; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 17247. A bill to provide that expenditures made in connection with certain structures and facilities in the city of Bethlehem, Pa., may be counted as local grants-in-aid toward an urban renewal project in that city; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 17248. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 17249. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that an individual's entitlement to retirement benefits under that act or the Social Security Act while he or she is entitled to dependent's or survivor's benefits under the other such act shall not operate to prevent any increases in his or her benefits under the 1937 act which would otherwise result under the so-called social security minimum guarantee provision; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 17250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 17251. A bill to amend the act of March 1, 1933 (47 Stat. 1418), entitled "An act to permanently set aside certain lands in Utah as an addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 17252. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 17253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 17254. A bill to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 17255. A bill to provide for the more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends payable by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits or share accounts, to authorize higher reserve requirements on time deposits at member banks, to authorize open market operations in agency issues by the Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 17256. A bill to amend and extend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 17257. A bill to amend and extend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.J. Res. 1279. Joint resolution designating the month of September in 1966 as National Safety Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 986. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Con. Res. 987. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Res. 985. Resolution to include drum and bugle corps under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H. Res. 986. Resolution to create a permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H. Res. 987. Resolution relative to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee making an investigation and study of certain policies of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 17258. A bill for the relief of Bodo Diehn, Ph. D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 17259. A bill for the relief of Dino J. Caterini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17260. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Jellison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17261. A bill for the relief of Augustus J. Theodore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 17262. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Janet A. Vaughn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 17263. A bill for the relief of Garabet Civelekyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 17264. A bill for the relief of Vilmos Levay, Isabella Levay, Vilmos Levay, Jr., and Arpad Cornelio Levay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17265. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Sacco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17266. A bill for the relief of Gilfroia Sacco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 17267. A bill for the relief of Luis A. de la Vega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 17268. A bill for the relief of Lee Chin Yuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 17269. A bill for the relief of Albert L. Kellyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24, 1966

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all men, Thou hast taught us that in quietness and in confidence shall be our strength. In the midst of these feverish days we pray that Thou wilt breathe through the heats of our desire Thy coolness and Thy balm.

Take from our souls the strain and stress and let our ordered lives confess the beauty of Thy peace.

Strengthen us with Thy might that the anxious pressures of these days may not break our spirits and that no denials of human freedom now loose in the world may intimidate our souls.

Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy holy spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy holy name.

We ask it in the name of that one who is the truth and the way. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 23, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures for the period January 1 to June 30, 1966, which, with an accompanying report, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 6686. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act with respect to the U.S. Botanic Garden, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1488).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 3198. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (Rept. No. 1489).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 293. Resolution to create a special committee on the organization of the Congress composed of the six Senators who are members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (Rept. No. 1490).

By Mr. ALLOTT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1231. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Boulder County, Colo., to W. F. Stover (Rept. No. 1492).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 3178. A bill to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315g) (Rept. No. 1493); and

S. 3354. A bill to amend the law establishing the revolving fund for expert assistance loans to Indian tribes (Rept. No. 1518).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2829. A bill to amend section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Rept. No. 1495);

S. 2955. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Pigford (Rept. No. 1494);

H.R. 1822. An act for the relief of Won Loy Jung (Rept. No. 1496); and

H.R. 3233. An act for the relief of Emanuel G. Topakas (Rept. No. 1497).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 690. A bill for the relief of Norman J. Pitman (Rept. No. 1508);

S. 1572. A bill for the relief of Merritt A. Seefeldt and August C. Seefeldt (Rept. No. 1509);

S. 1987. A bill for the relief of Rollo Oskey (Rept. No. 1510);

S. 2500. A bill for the relief of James A. Todd, Jr. (Rept. No. 1511);

S. 2904. A bill for the relief of Clarence C. and Lucy W. Russell (Rept. No. 1512);

H.R. 5552. An act for the relief of David B. Glidden (Rept. No. 1513);

H.R. 7354. An act for the relief of Norman Morris Rains (Rept. No. 1514);

H.R. 11940. An act for the relief of Fred M. Osteen (Rept. No. 1515);

H.R. 12315. An act for the relief of Anthony A. Calloway (Rept. No. 1516); and

H.R. 12884. An act for the relief of John R. Sylvia (Rept. No. 1517).

By Mr. DODD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 2653. An act to provide that the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia shall also be held at New London, Conn. (Rept. No. 1506).

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 1483. An act for the relief of John V. Boland Construction Co. (Rept. No. 1501).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 3576. A bill to amend section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the jurisdiction and venue of applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody under judgments and sentences of State courts (Rept. No. 1502); and

H.R. 3999. An act to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have (Rept. No. 1504).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the 30th day of September in 1966 as "Bible Translation Day" (Rept. No. 1505).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2190. A bill to permit the compelling of testimony with respect to certain crimes, and the granting of immunity in connection therewith (Rept. No. 1498).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2188. A bill to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States (Rept. No. 1499); and

S. 2207. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code, "Patents," and the Trademark Act of July 5, 1946, as amended, with respect to appeals in patent and trademark cases (Rept. No. 1500).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 3404. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to transfer an inmate of the District of Columbia jail to any other institution under the control and supervision of the Director of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections notwithstanding the pendency of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus with respect to such inmate (Rept. No. 1503); and

S. 3488. A bill to grant the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to amend the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact to establish an organization empowered to provide transit facilities in the National Capital Region and for other purposes and to enact said amendment for the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1491).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1356. A bill to amend the Judicial Code to permit Indian tribes to maintain civil actions in Federal district courts without regard to the $10,000 limitation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1507).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 13703. An act to make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code (Rept. No. 1520).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 11087. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, and the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, as amended, with respect to certain foreign corporations (Rept. No. 1521).

CARRIAGE OF MILITARY CARGOES BY U.S.-FLAG VESSELS AT REDUCED RATES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1519)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 3297) to authorize the carriage of military cargoes by U.S.-flag vessels at reduced rates which are fair and reasonable. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators LAUSCHE and HART.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

IRMA NEELY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original reso-

lution (S. Res. 296); which was placed on the calendar:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Irma Neely, widow of Garrett Neely, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to eleven months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JAVITS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Constance Baker Motley, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3756. A bill to provide that certain highways extending from Laredo, Tex., to the point where U.S. Highway 81 crosses the border between North Dakota and Canada shall be known collectively as the "Pan American Highway"; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 3757. A bill to amend Public Law 89-284 relating to participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr BREWSTER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York., Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 3758. A bill to authorize the establishment and operation by Gallaudet College of a model secondary school for the deaf to serve the National Capital region; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3759. A bill for the relief of Luis Tapia Davila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

IRMA NEELY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 296) to pay a gratuity to Irma Neely, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. YARBOROUGH, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JAVITS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. YARBOROUGH, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

Statement by him regarding a recent trip to Europe by the International Peace Garden Tour Band and Choir of Dunseith, N. Dak.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Statement prepared by Senator MORTON on the record of the Johnson-Humphrey administration.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

BILL TO CREATE INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to offer a bill for introduction and appropriate reference. This bill would provide that certain highways extending from Laredo, Tex., to the point where U.S. Highway 81 crosses the border, between North Dakota and Canada shall be known collectively as the Pan-American Highway.

This highway, which already crosses the United States from Canada to the Mexican border, largely follows U.S. Highway 81, with varying differences in some sections of the Nation. If created, it would connect with the Pan-American Highway, which begins at Laredo, Tex., and extends to Panama. The bill I offer would create this highway and would designate it as the Inter-American Highway.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed as a part of these remarks, and that an article which appeared in the Pan American News, Wednesday, April 13, 1966, entitled "What Is the Inter-American Highway?" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3756) to provide that certain highways extending from Laredo, Tex., to the point where U.S. Highway 81 crosses the border between North Dakota and Canada shall be known collectively as the "Pan American Highway," introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3756

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for the purpose of any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States, those highways which extend from Laredo, Texas, to the point where United States Highway 81 crosses the border between North Dakota and Canada and which are listed in subsection (b) of this section shall be known collectively as the "Pan American Highway".

(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the highways which shall be known collectively as the "Pan American Highway", and the cities between which such highways extend, are as follows:

Highways: Interstate System Highways 35, 35E, 35W, 235, and 29; United States Highways 81, 77, and 377; and Nebraska Highway 92.

Extending from south to north between the following cities: In the State of Texas, the following cities: Laredo, San Antonio, Austin, Waco, Fort Worth, Dallas, Denton, and Gainesville; in the State of Oklahoma, the following cities: Ardmore, Pauls Valley, Oklahoma City, and Guthrie; in the State of Kansas, the following cities: Wichita, Newton, Lindsborg, Concorida, and Beleville; and in the State of Nebraska, the following cities: Geneva, York, Columbus, and Norfolk; in the State of South Dakota, the following cities: Yankton, Madison, Brookings, and Watertown; in the State of North Dakota, the following cities: Wahpeton, Fargo, Grand Forks, Drayton, and Pembina.

(2) If more than one of the highways listed in paragraph (1) extends between any two points between any two of the cities listed in that paragraph which are not separated by any other city listed in that paragraph, the Secretary of Commerce shall designate which of those highways shall be included in the group of highways to be collectively known as the "Pan American Highway".

The article, presented by Mr. CARLSON, is as follows:

WHAT IS THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY?

The Inter-American Highway is that part of the Pan American Highway System spanning the length of Mexico and the six Central American Republics from Laredo, Texas, to Panama City. The Pan American Highway System, as a whole, is a network of main highways, existing or planned, traversing and linking all of the countries of South

and Central America. Each country has designated the routes within its own borders.

The idea of linking the Americas began with the dream of a railroad, first proposed in the 1880's. The proposal was formerly initiated at the First Conference of American States in 1889 and was promoted at successive Inter-American Conferences over the next 50 years. However, the proposed project has never reached the construction stage. The Fifth Conference of American States, held in 1923, while still promoting the idea of a railroad, also recommended that an Automobile Road Conference be held, looking toward the construction of highways within and between the countries of the Americas. Thus began the idea of the Pan American Highway System, of which the Inter-American Highway is a part.

The United States gave it first direct financial support to the idea when, in 1930, the Congress provided $50,000 for a reconnaissance survey of a road to link the American continents. The Bureau of Public Roads, in cooperation with the Central American Republics, completed this survey, from the United States border to Panama City, in 1933.

The Government of Mexico had already begun to build its part of the Inter-American Highway, and has continued the work with its own funds and engineering forces, without assistance from the United States.

Since 1930, the United States has appropriated $138.7 million for the construction of the Inter-American Highway in the Central American Republics, and authorized an additional $32 million for its completion, under the supervision and management of the Bureau of Public Roads. Generally, the work has been done on a cooperative basis, with the United States paying two-thirds of the cost. In paying their one-third share of the cooperative work, and in independent work wholly financed with their own funds, the cooperating Republics have spent more than $82 million in the construction of the Inter-American Highway since the beginning of the program and will spend at least $16 million more in matching the additional $32 million in United States funds authorized for completion.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 89-284, RELATING TO PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE HEMISFAIR 1968 EXPOSITION TO BE HELD IN SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce today, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing U.S. participation in the HemisFair, along with an authorization of $10 million for construction of appropriate Federal structures and for operating expenses.

It is vitally important to the continued progress of HemisFair that anticipated Federal participation be promptly authorized, and it is my hope that committee consideration and Senate approval can be promptly given. My bill is a companion to that previously introduced in the House by Congressman GONZALEZ, of San Antonio. The House bill, H.R. 15098, has been approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and House floor action on it is expected within the next few days.

By introducing this bill, I hope to expedite Senate approval to further carry out the intent of Public Law 89-284, which authorized planning for U.S. participation and which officially recognized the fair.

Mr. President, since passage of Public Law 89-284 last October, much has been accomplished in planning and actual construction at the San Antonio site of the fair. I would like to review the highlights of the progress that has been made, for the benefit of my colleagues.

The Senate will remember that last year Congress approved and the President signed legislation granting congressional recognition to HemisFair, requesting the President to invite the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in it, directing that a study be conducted to determine the manner in which, and the extent to which, the United States should be a participant and exhibitor and providing $125,000 for planning for this purpose.

Since that time substantial progress has been achieved.

Acquisition of land for HemisFair was 99.6 percent complete as of June 16, 1966.

Demolition on the site will be completed as of the end of this month.

Construction of an $8 million civic center complex which will be leased for the fair began several months ago.

The arena is 16 percent ahead of schedule.

The theater foundation is complete with basic flooring, orchestra pits, and stage.

The exhibit hall has been excavated and foundation for part of the basement is complete.

Construction of the State of Texas exhibit is scheduled to begin prior to October 1.

Five pavilions for foreign governments are to be completed before the end of the summer.

Approximately one-third of all private exhibit space available at the exposition has been committed or optioned.

Final approval and sanction of HemisFair 1968 has been granted by the Bureau of International Expositions in Paris.

And thus far nine foreign governments have indicated plans to participate in the exposition.

A $30 million local bond issue has been made for financing the fair.

Local San Antonio businessmen have pledged $7.5 million working capital for the fair corporation, and the State of Texas has indicated it will invest $10 million in the State pavilion and exhibits.

These facts and other indications of substantial progress to date led the House Foreign Affairs Committee to observe in its report that these actions appear "to insure the initial success of this undertaking."

The proposed U.S. pavilion and exhibits which were designed under the supervision of the Department of Commerce carry out the theme "Confluence U.S.A.," and are designed to illustrate the blending of many cultures in the United States and their influence upon our own past, present, and future.

I have seen drawings and have reviewed the proposed plans for the U.S. structures. I am frankly quite enthusiastic about the proposed manner of our participation on the Federal level.

Approximately $6,210,500 will be required for the construction costs of the building; $1,740,000 for the costs of exhibits; $368,000 for maintenance and dismantling expenses, and $1,697,000 for administrative and operating expenses.

Through the foresighted planning of the Department of Commerce and other agencies which worked on plans for the U.S. pavilions, there is expected to be a residual dollar benefit of $2 million from the use of the foundation if the building is dismantled after the fair. It is planned that the foundation can be utilized for the construction of a 10-story office building.

The bill I introduce today provides:

That the President is authorized to appoint with the consent of the Senate a commissioner for a Federal exhibit at the HemisFair.

For upgrading Federal involvement from "planning" to "participation."

For authorization of the Secretary of Commerce to enter into the necessary contracts, and to erect buildings, and to spend a sum not to exceed $10 million for these purposes.

The community of San Antonio and the entire State of Texas have been generous in their time and financial support of this Inter-American project, which will be of special value to American-Latin relations.

I hope Federal participation will be of a scope appropriate to the large dimensions and potential of HemisFair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3757) to amend Public Law 89-284 relating to participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 761, 762, 767, AND 768

Mr. ELLENDER submitted four amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 13712) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 763

Mr. KUCHEL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 13712, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. KUCHEL, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 764

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. GRIF-

FIN) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 13712, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 765

Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 13712, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 766

Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. COOPER) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 13712, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 769

Mr. FANNIN proposed an amendment to House bill 13712, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when proposed by Mr. FANNIN, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 16, 1966, the names of Mr. HART and Mr. MONDALE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3731) to strengthen the administration of the Flammable Fabrics Act, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and other Senators) on August 16, 1966.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill S. 3699, the Fair Farm Budget Act, the name of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT NO. 716

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment—No. 716—that I offered as a substitute for S. 564, on July 28, 1966, and known as the Lead and Zinc Act of 1966.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WADE HAMPTON McCREE, JR., OF MICHIGAN, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, SIXTH CIRCUIT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, September 1, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nomination:

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.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

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.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, August 31, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of John S. Hayes, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

In accordance with the committee rules, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH REPUBLIC OF CHINA—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I wish to inform the Senate that pursuant to section 123(c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to the Joint Committee a proposed amendment to the existing civil agreement for cooperation between the United States and the Republic of China. The proposed amendment was received by the Joint Committee on August 23, 1966.

Yesterday I informed this body of a proposed agreement for cooperation with Sweden and a proposed amendment to the agreement for cooperation with Israel previously received by the Joint Committee. See page 20306 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 23. The proposed agreement with Sweden and the proposed amendments to the agreements with Israel and China will be the subject of a subcommittee public hearing scheduled for Thursday, August 25, 1966.

The proposed amendment to the agreement for cooperation with the Republic of China would increase to 8 kilograms the quantity of uranium 235 which may be transferred to the Republic of China for fueling of research reactors. The amendment would also reflect changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permitting private ownership of special nuclear materials by enabling private parties in the United States and the Republic of China to be parties to arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material.

Special nuclear material transferred under the existing agreement and under the amended agreement will be covered by safeguards administered by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Section 123(c) of the act requires that the proposed amendment lie before the Joint Committee for a period of 30 days while Congress is in session before becoming effective. It is the general practice of the Joint Committee to publish proposed civil agreements for cooperation in the RECORD and to hold public hearings thereon.

In keeping with this practice, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the proposed amendment together with supporting correspondence.

There being no objection, the amendment and supporting correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: Pursuant to Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

a. a proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

b. a copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

c. a copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The proposed amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, revises the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and China which was signed on July 18, 1955, as amended by the agreements signed on December 8, 1958, June 11, 1960, May 31, 1962, and June 8, 1964.

Article II of the proposed amendment would raise from six to eight kilograms the

quantity of U-235 in enriched uranium which may be used for fueling research reactors in China at any time. The existing language of Article II in the agreement which provides for the transfer of an additional amount to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors is being retained.

Article II would also permit the transfer to China of material enriched to more than 20% in the isotope U-235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer.

Article III of the proposed amendment reflects the recent changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permitting private ownership of special nuclear material by enabling private parties in the United States and China to be parties to arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material. Previously, such arrangements were confined to governments. Arrangements made directly between private parties under proposed Article III would be undertaken pursuant to applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the United States and China. A similar provision has been incorporated in the agreements with Switzerland, the Philippines, Turkey, and the U.K., and the proposed Swedish agreement and Israeli amendment.

Inasmuch as the transfer of highly enriched fuel would be permitted under the proposed amendment, comprehensive bilateral safeguards have also been included. The Chinese research reactor and fuel obtained from the United States, however, are under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, as provided in the trilateral agreement among the United States, China, and the Agency, which entered into force on October 29, 1965. Accordingly, as with the present bilateral safeguards, the comprehensive bilateral safeguards would be suspended as long as the trilateral safeguards remain in force. United States safeguards would be resumed, however, if for any reason Agency safeguards should cease to apply.

Additionally, the formulation in Article I respecting information exchange has been brought into conformity with currently used language, and redundant features of Paragraph A of Article II have been eliminated. Articles V and VI contain minor editorial revisions.

The amendment will enter into force on the day on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements to bring the amendment into force.

Cordially,

S. M. NABRIT,
Acting Chairman.

Enclosures:

1. Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of the Republic of China (3).
2. Letter from the Commission to the President (3).
3. Letter from the President to the Commission (3).

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and China which was signed at Washington on July 18, 1955, as amended by the Agreements signed December 8, 1958, June 11, 1960, May 31, 1962, and June 8, 1964. The Agreement for Cooperation pertains to research in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, particularly through the utilization of research reactors. The agreement is scheduled to expire on July 17, 1974.

Article II of the proposed amendment to the agreement would raise from six to eight kilograms the net quantity of U-235 which may be transferred to China for fueling research reactors. In addition, Article II would permit the transfer to China of material enriched to more than 20% in the isotope U-235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer.

Article III of the proposed amendment reflects the recent changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permitting private ownership of special nuclear material by enabling private parties in the United States and China to be parties to arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material. Previously, such arrangements were confined to governments. Arrangements made directly between private parties under proposed Article III would be undertaken pursuant to applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the United States and China.

Inasmuch as the transfer of highly enriched fuel would be permitted under the proposed amendment, comprehensive bilateral safeguards have also been included. The Chinese research reactor and fuel obtained from the United States, however, are under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, as provided in the trilateral agreement among the United States, China, and the Agency which came into effect on October 29, 1965. Accordingly, the bilateral safeguards in the proposed amendment would be suspended as long as the trilateral safeguards currently applied by the International Atomic Energy Agency remain in force; however, U.S. safeguards would be resumed if for any reason Agency safeguards should cease to apply.

The proposed amendment also includes several minor revisions. Article I would conform fields of information exchange to our more current practice, while Paragraph A of Article II combines language presently in the agreement to eliminate unnecessary repetition. Articles V and VI of the proposed amendment include minor editorial revisions.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China. In compliance with Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, it will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

Enclosure: Proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China."

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 23, 1966.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Atomic Energy Commission, Washington.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me by letter dated August 17, 1966, a proposed Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy and has recommended that I approve the proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution.

Pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) approve the proposed amendment and determine that the performance of the Agreement, as amended, will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) authorize the execution of the proposed amendment on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China, signed at Washington on July 18, 1955 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"), as amended by the Agreements signed at Washington on December 8, 1958, June 11, 1960, May 31, 1962, and June 8, 1964,

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article I, Paragraph A of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"A. Subject to the limitations of Article V, the Parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

"1. design, construction, operation, and use of research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments;

"2. the use of radioactive isotope and source, special nuclear, or byproduct material in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry; and

"3. health and safety problems related to the foregoing."

ARTICLE II

A. Article II, Paragraph A of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"A. The Commission will transfer to the Government of the Republic of China uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, subject to the terms and conditions herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments which the Government of the Republic of China, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct or operate or

decides to authorize private individuals and private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct or operate."

B. Article II, Paragraph B of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended as follows:

1. The number, "six (6)", is deleted wherever it appears and the number, "eight (8)", is substituted in lieu thereof.

2. The last sentence thereof is deleted and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

"The Commission may, however, upon request, make all or a portion of the foregoing special nuclear material available as uranium enriched to more than twenty percent (20%) by weight in the isotope U-235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer for use in research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed eight (8) kilograms of the isotope U-235 contained in such uranium."

ARTICLE III

Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information referred to in Article I, it is understood that arrangements may be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other for the transfer of materials, including special nuclear material, and equipment and devices, and for the performance of services. Such arrangements shall be subject to:

"1. the limitations applicable to transactions between the Parties under Article II;

"2. Article V; and

"3. applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the Parties."

ARTICLE IV

Paragraphs A, B, and C of Article VI of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of the Republic of China or any person under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

"B. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this Agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the Parties as provided in Article VII(A), by safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Government of the United States of America, nowithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

(1) With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any (a) reactor, and (b) other equipment and devices, the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards, which are, or have been, made available to the Government of the Republic of China or any person under its jurisdiction under this Agreement, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission;

(2) With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available under this Agreement to the Government of the Republic of China or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment or devices so made available:

(a) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission,

(b) reactors,

(c) any other equipment or device designated by the Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this subparagraph B(2) will apply,

(i) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such materials; and

(ii) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of the Republic of China or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this Article and the guaranties set forth in Article VII;

(3) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph B(2) of this Article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in the Republic of China and which is not retained or purchased by the Government of the United States of America pursuant to Paragraphs E or F, respectively, of Article II, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the Parties;

(4) To designate, after consultation with the Government of the Republic of China, personnel who, accompanied, if either Party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of the Republic of China, shall have access in the Republic of China to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph B(2) of this Article, to determine whether there is compliance with this Agreement, and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

(5) In the event of non-compliance with the provisions of this Article or the guaranties set forth in Article VII and the failure of the Government of the Republic of China to carry out the provisions of this Article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this Agreement and to require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph B(2) of this Article;

(6) To consult with the Government of the Republic of China in the matter of health and safety.

"C. The Government of the Republic of China undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this Article."

ARTICLE V

Article VII, Paragraph B of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by adding the words, "or group of nations", following the word, "nation", wherever it appears.

ARTICLE VI

Article VII(A)1 of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended by deleting the reference, "paragraph C", and the commas preceding and following such reference.

ARTICLE VII

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended.

In Witness Whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this — day of ——, 1966.

For the Government of the United States of America:

(DZ)
DONOVAN Q. ZOOK,
Director, Office of Atomic Energy Affairs, International Scientific and Technological Affairs, Department of State.

(BHT)
BARBARA H. THOMAS,
Foreign Affairs Officer, Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Republic of China:

(MW)
MARTIN WONG,
Economic Minister Counselor, Chinese Embassy, Washington, D.C.

VIETNAM—DEESCALATION OR COMPLETE VICTORY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Monday, according to the New York Times, the Secretary of State visited U Thant. He also spoke to the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

In the conversation with Mr. U Thant—according to the Times—the Secretary asserted that the "United States wanted to de-escalate the Vietnam war" but said there was lack of interest on the part of Hanoi and its allies.

Speaking to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, however, the Secretary of State said that a premature pullout from Vietnam would surely lead to world war III. According to the paper, Mr. Rusk said:

> Any withdrawal before complete victory over Communist aggression would be * * * fatal.

So one can take a choice of U.S. policy—deescalation or complete victory. Except that I had always presumed that these were mutually exclusive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times]

RUSK ASSERTS UNITED STATES FAVORS WAR CURB BUT FOES SHUN IT—TALKS OF VIETNAM WITH THANT AND CALLS FOR BOLSTERING OF TRUCE UNIT IN CAMBODIA—LEADERS CONFER AT U.N.—VETERANS TOLD BY SECRETARY AN EARLY PULL-OUT COULD SPUR WORLD WAR III

(By Kathleen Teltsch)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., August 22.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk told U Thant today that the United States wanted to de-escalate the Vietnam war but that there had been a lack of interest on the part of Hanoi and its allies.

Mr. Rusk visited the Secretary General and said later that he had assured Mr. Thant of the interest of the United States in scaling down the war.

[North Vietnam officially denounced all American efforts to end the Vietnam war and rejected the proposal by its Asian neighbors to hold a peace conference, according to a United Presss International dispatch from Tokyo.]

Mr. Thant's position has been that the only way to get negotiations started is by halting the American bombing of North Vietnam.

He repeatedly has offered this as the first element of a three-point formula. The other points would be scaling down of fighting in the South and discussions by all the combatants, including the Vietcong.

Mr. Rusk said he had not gone into details on these three points during his talk with Mr. Thant.

INTEREST IN CAMBODIA

Discussing Vietnam's neighbor, the Secretary of State said he had renewed United States interest in strengthening the International Control Commission in Cambodia to help assure the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia.

The idea of bolstering the commission so that it could better police the frontier with South Vietnam was proposed by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the Cambodian chief of state, in December with the suggestion that Washington pay for strengthening it. In June, the United States said it would be pleased to do so because the United States sought to prevent the use of Cambodian territory by troops of North Vietnam.

The proposal has not been implemented although a Cambodian source said today that it still stood.

Reiteration by Mr. Rusk of the idea of strengthening the commission took on significance in light of the fact that the United States conceded last week that the border village bombed by American planes recently may have been in Cambodia.

The commission was set up under the 1954 Geneva agreements. Mr. Rusk, in referring to it, expressed disappointment that the cochairmen of the Geneva conference, Britain and the Soviet Union, had not been able to make progress on Prince Sihanouk's request. The United States has complained that the Soviet Union has not agreed to efforts to convene a Geneva meeting.

FIRST MEETING SINCE JUNE

Today's meeting between Mr. Rusk and Mr. Thant was their first since June 14, when the Secretary General went to Washington for a United Nations reception. At that time Mr. Thant said that they had talked casually for only "a few moments," that Vietnam was touched on but that "nothing of substance" had been discussed.

By contrast, Mr. Rusk and Mr. Thant conferred in the Secretary General's 38th-floor offices for 65 minutes. Mr. Rusk was accompanied by Ambassador James M. Nabrit Jr. of the United States delegation, who is deputy permanent representative.

Mr. Rusk said on leaving that he and Mr. Thant had discussed the coming General Assembly and Southeast Asia and Vietnam. He said the talks had been "useful and helpful."

Mr. Rusk said that he had not discussed with Mr. Thant the United States' request that he stay on as Secretary General, but that American support for Mr. Thant was well known. Mr. Thant's term ends Nov. 3.

A WARNING BY RUSK

(By Homer Bigart)

Secretary Rusk warned in a speech here yesterday that a premature American pullout from South Vietnam would "surely" lead to World War III.

Any withdrawal before complete victory over Communist aggression would be as fatal as were attempts to appease the Axis powers in the nineteen-thirties, Mr. Rusk said at the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at the New York Hilton Hotel.

He implied that had President Kennedy lived, American combat troops would be as heavily committed in Vietnam as they are under President Johnson.

He said President Kennedy had "never faltered" in taking whatever action was necessary to preserve South Vietnam's independence. He recalled Mr. Kennedy's saying two months before his assassination, "But we are not there [in Vietnam] to see a war lost."

SCHLESINGER'S VIEW

This does not agree with the recollections of Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., the historian, who said in his book "A Thousand Days" that President Kennedy never regarded Vietnam as a top-priority problem. Moreover, Mr. Schlesinger said President Kennedy believed a heavy American troop build-up might turn Vietnamese nationalism against the United States and transform an Asian civil conflict into a white man's war.

After discussing Mr. Kennedy's position on Vietnam, Secretary Rusk lauded President Johnson as "one of the most resolute Presidents this country ever had." He said:

"President Johnson has faced great alternatives:

"We can quit [in Vietnam] and await the great catastrophe that surely awaits at the end of the trail.

"Or we can meet these people who are coming in from North Vietnam. And our people are meeting them with a skill that is deeply moving.

"Now that's what this is all about. Either we act to prevent war or sit with neglect and wait for it to happen."

EARLIER VIEW RECALLED

Mr. Rusk noted that between World Wars I and II many Americans looked on Japan's aggression in Manchuria as unimportant to their national security.

He said Americans in those days reassured themselves by saying: "Well, maybe if the aggressors get just another bite they'll be happy," or "You have to remember they've been treated pretty poorly in the past."

"That was the cynicism, that was the neglect that led to World War II," Mr. Rusk said.

He described the Veterans of Foreign Wars as "a group not confused about why we're fighting in Vietnam."

"Our objective," he said, "is peace—peace that permits an independent people in any area to live in peace with institutions of their own choice."

He added:

"Once in a while I see a picket carrying a 'Peace in Vietnam' sign. I'm tempted to go and say, 'Let me help you carry that sign because President Johnson has taken that sign into every capital in the world'."

Secretary Rusk said American troops in Vietnam would "come home tomorrow if the [North Vietnamese] infiltration stopped and those who have no business in South Vietnam would go home."

"But they still keep coming," he said.

"If anyone from Hanoi can be in Geneva tomorrow morning to talk peace, I will be there," Mr. Rusk said.

Declaring that successive administrations in Washington had found the continued independence of South Vietnam vital to American security, the Secretary said there could be no doubt about the depth of the commitment in Southeast Asia.

He said that the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and other defensive alliances were "the backbone of world peace," and that if Moscow and Peking concluded that the United States was backing down on its pledges to those alliances, the world would face the prospect of World War III.

He predicted that if President Johnson prevailed in South Vietnam "a hundred small nations around the world will clap their hands in joy."

The United States, he said, is not trying to "wipe out" North Vietnam, nor does it seek any bases in Vietnam.

"All we want," he added, "is an enduring peace, and what's wrong with that?"

The national Veterans of Foreign Wars Armed Forces Award was given to Col. Michael Yunck of the Marines in recognition of "his compassion for his fellow man and his dedication to American ideals as shown by his actions when he risked death and injury so that Vietnamese civilians might live."

Colonel Yunck, still on active duty despite the loss of a leg, told the veterans: "We will continue the fight in Vietnam until that country can join us in the family of free nations, free from fear of aggression."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a short article from the Manchester Guardian, entitled "The Fears of U Thant."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester Guardian, Aug. 12, 1966]

THE FEARS OF U THANT

"I am increasingly convinced," said the UN Secretary-General, U Thant, last Saturday, "that the Vietnam war will develop into a major war if the present trend continues." No one who did not foresee the war's expansion to its present scale has the right to contradict him—least of all the United States Administration, which is now employing forces and using methods beyond anything it dreamed of only two years ago. The expansion continues day by day, with occasional major leaps. Mr. Wilson's visit to Washington at the end of last week was marked by the heaviest raids on North Vietnam so far, and also by the first intentional raids by US aircraft on the demilitarised zone between North and South Vietnam. If, as a US military spokesman claimed, the targets were troop concentrations and fortifications, then the North Vietnamese can be blamed for initiating this bit of escalation by introducing them; but that confirms rather than invalidates U Thant's thesis. U Thant's fear that the war may "spill over the frontiers" is already being fulfilled. Siam has long been a major base for the US air raids on the North, and it gets daily more disturbing that Britain is involved to the extent of building a military airfield there.

But, if both sides are contributing to the expansion of the war, the US responsibility is by far the greater. That is inevitable, quite apart from any questions of right and wrong; for the military resources that the United States can throw in are vast compared with those of Vietnam. A halt in the escalation does not depend on the Vietcong, or even, as Mr. Wilson often suggests, on Hanoi—unless it wants to surrender, for that (it may reasonably fear) is what accepting American terms for talks would imply at present.

Still less can Peking or Moscow save the nations from the fate that U Thant fears; they have already shown how reluctant they are to get involved in the fighting. The choice of peace and war is in American hands, and the fact that those who have to make it do not see it in such stark terms renders it all the easier for them to choose the wrong thing: war will come creeping up on them and tighten its coils, as it has been doing up to now. Already it is hard to see how they can escape honourably. But if they cannot at this stage contemplate withdrawing, they can at least not go on making things worse. That is an immediate decision they could take towards ending the war.

It does not depend on any elaborate peace proposals, but would contribute to a situation which might later make them possible. Now, however, it seems that the US leaders are set on victory, and we may even fear, as U Thant seems to, that they will stop of nothing short of it—even world war. The danger is all the greater in that, through the nature of the war, the victory they seek is impossible.

CONDITIONS IN SAIGON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, several weeks ago, in an open hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Secretary of Defense challenged a statement which I had made, which in turn was based upon an article in the New York Times written by Neil Sheehan. That article dealt with conditions in Saigon resulting from the war and the infusion of such vast numbers of foreign troops.

It is regrettable that the Secretary of Defense, who is so powerful in the making of policy in our Government and in the conduct of the war, is so badly informed about actual conditions in the theater of war.

Recently, Mr. Eric Pace, in the New York Times, and Mr. Robert Guillain, in Le Monde of Paris, have given us further reports on the conditions in Saigon.

I believe it might be beneficial to our national welfare if those who direct our foreign policy were made aware of what is happening in Saigon and in Vietnam.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the article from the New York Times of August 5, 1966, by Mr. Eric Pace and a translation of the article by Mr. Guillain which appeared in Le Monde of Paris on May 21, 1966.

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

WAR SPURS DELINQUENCY AMONG GIRLS IN VIETNAM—INSTITUTION FOR THEM, RUN BY NUNS AT SAIGON'S COST, HAS TO BE ENLARGED

(By Eric Pace)

VINHLONG, SOUTH VIETNAM, August 3.—The South Vietnamese Government is quietly doubling the capacity of its only rehabilitation center for delinquent girls, officials disclosed today.

"We're getting all the stragglers in the flock," said Sister Mary, the strapping Irish nun who runs the center, which is in a former military barracks in this provincial capital 65 miles southwest of Saigon.

"The presence of so many troops makes a fantastic amount of prostitution," she said. "It's out of control now in Saigon, and I think the Vietnamese resent this more than anything else about the expanding of the war, more even than the bombing."

Sister Mary's charges, dressed in neat white blouses, gazed coolly at a group of male visitors who were shepherded through the center's pastel arcades.

"There's Lisa," Sister Mary said. "She's 10. She was working in a brothel in Saigon."

"That is Rose; she used to steal 10,000 piasters [about $85] a day," the 43-year-old nun said, indicating another 10-year old, whose hair was carefully combed.

Sister Mary also pointed a 16-year-old named Margaret who had a demure pigtail. "She was kidnaped, drugged and put to work in a Saigon bar," the nun said softly.

Saigon courts provide the majority of the inmates of the institution, which is formally called the Center of Professional Guidance and is owned by the Government. Sister Mary and her staff of seven nuns are from the Order of the Good Shepherd, whose headquarters is in France.

Girls from 10 to 18 years old are admitted to the center, founded in 1958 by the Government of President Ngo Dinh Diem after a campaign against vice. Subsequent Governments have kept the center in operation.

The present capacity of 170 girls will be increased by 150 when building is completed. The new house will contain a dining hall and quarters for unwed mothers and their children.

Construction on the project has lagged because of a lack of funds from the Government, although Sister Mary maintains that the program should be vastly expanded.

Though limited in size, the existing quarters are elaborately appointed, with a tennis court and swimming pool. The girls have their own mandolin ensemble, and are instructed in cooking and painting in addition to regular school subjects.

Older girls are allowed to go on dates with local boys whom they meet through Catholic youth activities. When the girls reach 18, the nuns try to find them jobs and homes elsewhere. Sister Mary said that most of her alumnae found a satisfactory niche in the outside world, and that numbers of them returned for visits.

With the sharp increase in prostitution, the courts no longer commit a girl simply for being a prostitute. "That would be like trying to stop a tidal wave," Sister Mary said. Those sent to the center have generally been involved in more serious crimes, such as kidnapping other girls.

Many of the younger inmates, though, are simply homeless urchins found roaming, like alley cats, down Saigon's boulevards, begging or stealing from the markets.

"Their parents are generally dead or killed in the war, or working some place else," Sister Mary explained.

The less tractable girls are segregated in a room called "the dump heap." They were sewing pajamas for a Saigon hospital today while the radio played soothing songs from the American musical "South Pacific."

IN VIETNAM: THE SECOND "DIRTY WAR"

(By Robert Guillain)

I. SAIGON

Their heads shaved, their shoulders squared, their legs enormous, they are here in the streets of Saigon by the hundreds—the G.I. Almost all of them in civvies, shirts hanging loose over their trousers, they display in the city the vaguely restive boredom of the soldier on leave, out for a good time.

For those big white and black giants, a whole population of pint-sized yellow men seems to be there just to wait on them. They let themselves be wheeled around in bicycle rickshaws by half-naked coolies. They have their shoes shined by tiny 10-year old shoeshine boys. They let themselves be taken in tow by girls who hold them by the hand.

It is for them that the girls have given up the graceful Vietnamese tunic, the silk pantaloons, and the floating veils, to don teenager slacks fitting snugly at the thighs. At the street-corners the G.I. palavers with the young hoodlums and pimps in blue-jeans, who offer them girls, piasters on the black market, addresses for gambling, or opium. For them the sidewalks of the Boulevard Charner spill over with shoddy goods in atrociously poor taste, sold out in the open, where erotic nudes painted on silks, and contraceptives camouflaged in silver dollars, are in great demand.

The heart of the city belongs to them. Rue Catinat, ironically renamed in Vietnamese "Rue de la Liberte" [Freedom Street], has never seen so many pink-skinned and blond-haired people. The terraces of the cafes are crowded, invaded by men, all cut after the same pattern. The bars—there is one every 50 feet or so—have American names, such as "Chicago", or "Texas", and are crowded at all hours of the day or the night.

THE HEAD IS ROTTEN

Abroad, one readily imagines that Saigon lives in an atmosphere of war. War? But who thinks of it here but to detest it and to escape from it and to profit from it by the waltz of the dollars, and to mock it by the race to pleasures? In those far away places one also thinks that Saigon lives in fear, afraid every moment of the grenades or the time-bombs of the Viet Cong. Oh well, it's not that way at all! Saigon only dreams of making deals and having fun, at least when it is not feverish with political demonstrations. At long intervals, it is true, the bombs work havoc. But, except for bad luck, everybody feels safe, and Saigon is not to be compared with Algiers under terror. Why would the Viet Cong use terror when there is an evil there which rots it much more surely from within: corruption? A Vietnamese said to me: "In this war, the head is rotten: Saigon is it."

These American boys behave decently, however, they are not too quarrelsome, not too often intoxicated, always generous with their dollars. But when there are thousands every day to spend their savings, to look for girls, to carry on their little deals, for each G.I. does quite a business, when the tide of men, the Niagara of dollars, and the Himalaya of supplies fall on a poor and underdeveloped South Vietnam, on a South Vietnamese population whose fibre, not very strong to begin with, has suffered the wear and tear of twenty years of war, how could this country escape rottenness"?

The first few days, before I got used to it, the sight of Saigon gave me nausea. Because I had lived the Asian drama for a quarter of a century, had I myself become too "Asianized"? Anyway, I am sure that the Japanese, the Indians, and the Chinese who go to Saigon must feel as disgusted as I do. Well, then! After their 25 years of fighting and painful revolutions for Asia to be for the Asians, all of a sudden there are reinstalled in the capital of an Asian country, itself the center of world events, all the images overcome, all the odious images thought to have disappeared of a foreign and White supremacy.

Saigon, invaded as it never was under the French, more occupied than Japan after its defeat, more immoral than Tokyo during the Korean War . . . The Whites, masters of the city. The "buyers", back on the spot (the native businessmen who collaborate with the occupant . . .). The ministers, puppets on the string . . . The Vietnamese holding out their hand for a dier. . . . The Vietnamese girls who sell themselves. . . . But don't the Americans see that all this is a shocking sight? In the 15th or 20th year of decolonization, aren't they afraid of the judgments of the "Third World"? Don't they know what weapons they are giving their enemies when the Viet Cong can say: "Look, Saigon is no more than a brothel and a den of iniquity"?

PROSTITUTES AND RACKETEERS

Saigon's biggest industry today is prostitution. In Korea, during the other war, the Americans were boycotted by the proud Korean women. The Americans in Vietnam are much luckier: the women of Saigon can hardly resist their youth and their dollars, and the refugees from the rice-fields even

less. The bars with girls are making a mint. New bars are being opened all the time, through paying graft which may go as high as a million piasters.

That is where the G.I., who is fond of dim light, jazz music and whisky comes to find what he is looking for. He finds a "suite" everywhere, even in the most expensive and best known hotels; or in the thousands of rooms rented by the day or by the hour: it is no longer possible to keep count of the thousands of Vietnamese families who have adapted a part of their living quarters to such use; or in the sprawling straw-hut or shanty camps that have sprung up outside the American camps and along the roads, on the exits from Saigon, toward Tu-Duc, Bien-Hoa, Mytho. . . .

To work for the Americans, or simply to live near them is the ideal of thousands of Vietnamese. Pro-American? No, pro-dollar. Those G.I.'s the money is rolling out of their pockets all by itself. Near them, one has access to all the products, all the gadgets. The U.S. Army imports everything, even its wastepaperbaskets are "made in USA." To get near them means to get near the miraculous P.X., or army depot, and that means to join in the "trafficking" that surrounds the P.X.

This trafficking has two forms. First of all, hundreds of G.I.'s every day sell on the black market all kinds of purchases they make at the P.X. for that purpose. On the other hand, hundreds of tons of goods bound for the army depot regularly disappear between the pier of the port of Saigon and the depot in town, a distance of two kilometers. Entire trucks disappear en route, as though by magic. And everyone knows that this does not happen without a vast complicity network which must stretch beyond the customs officials, convoyers, Vietnamese police, etc.—who get themselves arrested from time to time—which must reach as far as the importing offices of the U.S. Army.

The diverted products reappear on the enormous outdoor market set up on the sidewalks, or in the stores all over the city. There one finds every conceivable type of commodity ranging from preserves to rare products labeled "not to be sold commercially." And the P.X. merchandise is not the only one to disappear. A certain "thieves market" in town specializes in the sale of brand new American uniforms. If you want to buy American arms, you can get the address.

CIVILIAN AND MILITARY "RACKETS"

Another lucrative big racket is in construction and housing. To get building materials, all kinds of graft must be paid, but the rich Vietnamese build one home after another and pay off the house within two years. They ask up to $800 a month for rent, knowing that their American tenants will always pay, even if they have to go out of their way to live in the villa and share the rent (sic—home?). The Chinese of Cholon build big eight to ten floor buildings profiting from the "cement racket," which is one of their private rackets. But which are not their rackets? Cartridge cases and scrap iron from the battle-fields, old tin cans, the flattened out metal of which is used for refugee huts. The Vietnamese compete: They traffic in automobile or scooter imports, pharmaceutical products, exemptions from military service, etc. Vietnamese, Chinese—or Americans, everybody cheerfully gets together in a major racket: the traffic in dollars and piasters. There are at least three recognized rates: the official rate, the military dollar rate, more than double, and the black market rate, more than triple. There are always people, as though there were any doubt, who have access to several rates and who thus build fortunes from clandestine exchange operations.

Many of even the highest-ranking officials take their own large slice from all these rackets. Under a regime which pays its officials ridiculous sums (a maximum of 50,000 old francs per month at least) embezzlement is a recognized practice: one gets paid out of State funds; "The mandarin also got paid, well, for life," a Vietnamese said to me, "The Minister of Tonton Diem for ten years, and the one we have today for one year"! "Bakashish" is indispensable on all sorts of occasions, and is demanded, especially, of the Americans. Officials make a fortune. Customs officials buy a Mercedes. Colonels build villas for themselves.

For the misappropriation of funds does not spare the South Vietnamese Army; it is even one of its diseases, in all ranks. The government soldier pillages the villages "on business." The superior officer serves his recruits two meals a day, instead of the three which are foreseen, and pockets the profit. When, all the same, this or that General or Colonel is perfectly honest, and many are, it is only too often his redoubtable wife who trafficks vigorously, like the wife who had her cement transported by army planes so she could build her villa.

The best explanation for all these practices is a simple one: it is an escape from insecurity. The war has been going on for 20 years. Death may come tomorrow; or destruction; or Communism. To escape the war, to hold on to something that is secure—that is the desperate reflex and the obsession of thousands of Vietnamese. Security, for many of them, lies in the piaster, or rather, the dollar, or an account in a Swiss bank. For others, French culture would be a form of escape, or a villa on the Cote d'Azur. Ah!, to go to France, to live in Paris, and never to come back! . . . It's better to desert a country which has become uninhabitable! If one could change the color of one's skin, one would do so. . . .

INFLATION

Meanwhile, even the profits from these doubtful practices are sapped by inflation. Its explosion coincided with the massive arrival of the American troops, and, therefore, the dollars. Prices rose 55 percent in 1965 and are climbing steadily, as a result of the deluge of money and shortage of goods. The Viet Cong know how to worsen the situation by economic warfare. They are cutting off Saigon's supplies of rice, milk, hogs, charcoal, etc.

It must be noted, and this is important, that not everybody suffers, far from it, because of the inflation and economic upsets. The American installations bring work to many little people, and the rackets are profitable. The people inside the hovels of the slums sometimes have more money than they have ever had before. The father works for the Americans as a coolie, the young son as a shoeshine boy, and the daughter is . . . "dutiful."

The people suffering most are the honest officials—there are some—and the little people with fixed incomes, especially the teachers, the intellectuals, and the students . . . when they go to school. Many live in tragic circumstances. The government official becomes a bicycle-rickshaw driver after hours, and the professor drives a cab in his spare time.

An old world is crumbling. The United States which has come to protect law and order in this country has made a powerful contribution to the general disorder. The government is rotten; the family falls apart; the social classes are in a state of decomposition. "The Confucian society had four classes", a Vietnamese said to me, "of which the Mandarin was the most respected. Today a popular saying lists the four classes by order of power and respect: the p . . ., the rickshaw coolies, the Chinese, and the Generals." And he adds: "Besides, things change very rapidly. Six months ago, the Generals were heading the list."

THE JOHNSON DOCTRINE IN ASIA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, some time ago I spoke in this Chamber about the Johnson doctrine in Asia. I suggested that before our country was committed to such a far-reaching undertaking in Asia, the Senate should be informed and should be given an opportunity to approve or disapprove of such a doctrine and such an undertaking.

No one from the executive branch has acknowledged the plan to commit us beyond the war in Vietnam. But it is interesting that Mr. Richard Wilson, who reputedly is close to the White House, has written a column confirming the thesis that I advanced on this floor.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Wilson be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON SETS GREAT POWER ROLE FOR UNITED STATES IN ASIA

(By Richard Wilson)

This government now intends to play the role of a great power in Asia where none before has succeeded in modern times, neither Russia, nor Japan, nor China. That was the meaning of President Johnson's recent Asian policy announcement.

It is an audacious policy three years in the making with some unlikely participants who in the end came to conclusions contrary to those they previously held.

Johnson can trace the Viet Nam intervention in some form back through Presidents Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy, but the new Asian policy he outlined in a nationally televised speech is strictly Johnsonian.

Four men in addition to the President—Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Defense Secretary Robert S. NcNamara and Walt Whitman Rostow—played the leading parts in the formulation of the policy. Rostow, the former Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor who advises the President on national security affairs, was the catalyst.

Not until Rostow came into the White House as heir apparent to McGeorge Bundy did the vague concepts of Asian intervention coalesce, through his incisive rationalizing, into a recognizable policy of great importance. The least likely and, in the end, the most enthusiastic of all the participants in making the policy was HUMPHREY, for he comes from that branch of the Democratic family that regards the Asian intervention as a tragic blunder.

Rusk brought to this policy his own preoccupation with Far Eastern affairs. This was his specialty in his earlier service in the State Department. McNamara, who in the beginning merely executed policy, has come to be a military philosopher, much concerned with the limits of the exercise of military power and eager to build bridges to China.

So, now, Johnson is asking this nation to turn its eyes and thoughts to Asia as the most crucial area of the world, not in the narrow sense of the limited Viet Nam war but in the same large sense as we have for three centuries judged our relationship to Europe.

This large order is not easily accepted by many who are learned in foreign affairs. We have been oriented to Europe in our major international relationships. The attention

of the nation has been commanded only by extraordinary events in Africa, Latin America or Asia. We fought a war in the Pacific and then, after a little time, went home and watched from afar the rise and spread of Communist governments. We fought to a stalemate in Korea and then tried to forget about it.

But the issue rose again and again throughout Asia until the last vestiges of European power vanished from there with the departure of the French from Southeast Asia and the British from India. Then by tentative stages the U.S. government moved in hesitantly with aid money and advisers to try to fill the vacuum that was drawing in the power of Communist China. These tentative stages grew into an important war in South Viet Nam.

That war has now been spread to a much larger canvas whereon the United States would design a peaceable and cooperative Asia and where, as the President said, the United States would meet its obligations as a Pacific power.

The President has finally spoken frankly in terms that can be understood both by those who agree and disagree with him. There is no longer any doubt why we are in Asia. We are there to stop aggression and use our power, as we have used it in Europe, to create stability under conditions that serve our interests best.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post, entitled "Our Great Power Role," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR GREAT POWER ROLE

President Johnson's message to the American Alumni Council makes the policy of the United States in Asia as clear as it can be made by the use of language. Citizens may quarrel with it, but they cannot fairly say they have any doubts about why we are in South Vietnam or about what we are doing in Asia.

As the President told the audience at White Sulphur Springs last night, we are in Asia to meet our obligations as a Pacific power, to prove to aggressive nations that the use of force is a losing game, to build the political and economic strength of the free nations of Asia, to further reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies.

The President has made the most powerful and persuasive declaration of his presidential career. It is a great state document stressing the ties that bind us to Asia. It scorns the suggestion that the Pacific is less "crossable" than the Atlantic. It boldly asserts American concern with peace in Asia and with the human rights of Asians. It warns his countrymen not to "retreat from the obligations of freedom and security in Asia."

The limited extent of our aims in South Vietnam is paired with the strongest assertion so far of this country's determination to pursue those ends. We are going to keep on until the Communists in North Vietnam "realize the price of aggression is too high." The blunt warning to Hanoi that "victory for your armies is impossible," that they "cannot drive us from South Vietnam by force," that we will resist as long as they "persist in aggression" is rescued from arrogance by the promise that as soon as the use of force is abandoned, the fighting will end—that the United States will be ready to "reciprocate."

The President's quick review of progress toward peace and security in other parts of Asia may be criticized as excessively optimistic. But the record justifies some optimism. Progress may not all be traceable to our stand in South Vietnam but it is not unrelated to it. After a long diet of handwringing, we can stand a little heartwarming.

The President has boldly and courageously committed this Nation to a great power role in Asia. It is a role for which many of his countrymen may not be prepared. It is a role from which most of them surely would like to escape. It is a role that history would have compelled them to disavow or embrace sooner or later. The war in South Vietnam is an incident that has hastened fateful decisions, but it probably has not basically altered them. The country had to choose between a present-day Asian variety of our historic small-power isolation and the world role of great power into which events have thrust it. The President's paper is a simple declaratory statement describing the task we have already undertaken—and one that we undertook, if we had rightly understood it—the moment that World War II compelled us to assemble the greatest military force in world history. That force and power deprived us of the luxury of indifference toward or isolation from events anywhere in the world.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Washington Post is an enthusiastic advocate of the administration's foreign policy, which of course it has a right to be. It says that the President has boldly and courageously committed this Nation to a great power role in Asia, but it never suggests that the Senate should be consulted.

I only suggest that it may well be that events will prove that this country should be a great power on the continent of Asia, but I still insist that it is proper—and I think wise—that such plans as exist in the Executive with regard to this matter should be submitted to the Senate, that we should have an opportunity to consider such plans and, I would hope, either to approve or disapprove of them.

The way we are now induced to commitments is so gradual and so subtle, that we have these commitments before any of us are aware of them. By that time, it is too late to exercise any independent judgment as to their wisdom.

Mr. President, as a part of these remarks, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the President's statement to which the article and the editorial refer.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 13, 1966]

ASIA—"PARTNER OR PROBLEM"

(Following is the prepared text of President Johnson's address last night, delivered from Washington to the American Alumni Council meeting at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.:)

As a former schoolteacher who turned to politics only to learn that all of life is a classroom, I have a very special respect for the work you do.

My own career, which began in a little school in South Texas, owes a great deal to men and women like you who labor that others might learn.

All my life I have taken seriously the warning that the world is engaged in a race between education and chaos. For the last two and one-half years I have lived with the daily awareness that the fate of mankind depends on the outcome of that race.

I came here tonight because you are committed, in the name of education, to help decide that contest. It is the most important victory we can ever win.

We have set out in this country to improve the quality of American life. We are concerned with each man's opportunity to develop his talents. We are concerned with his environment—the cities and farms where he lives, the air he breathes, the water he drinks. We seek to enrich the schools that educate him and to improve the governments that serve him.

We are at war against the poverty that deprives him, the unemployment that degrades him, and the prejudice that defies him.

As we look at other parts of the world, we see similar battles being fought in Asia, in Africa, and in Latin America. On every hand we see thirst for independence, the struggle for progress, and the frantic race between education and chaos.

In all these regions we, too, have a stake.

Nowhere are the stakes higher than in Asia. It is about Asia—and peace in Asia—that I wish to talk tonight.

I

Asia is now the crucial arena of man's striving for independence and order—and for life itself.

This is true because three out of every five people on this planet live in Asia.

This is true because hundreds of millions of them exist on less than 25 cents a day.

And this is true because Communists in Asia still believe in force to achieve their goals.

If enduring peace can come to Asia, all mankind will benefit. But if peace fails there, nowhere else will our achievements be secure.

By peace in Asia I do not mean simply the absence of armed hostilities. For where men hunger and hate, there can be no peace.

I do not mean the peace of conquest. For humiliation can be the seedbed of war.

And I do not mean simply the peace of the conference table. For peace is not written merely in the words of treaties, but in the day-to-day works of builders.

The peace we seek in Asia is a peace of conciliation, between Communist states and their non-Communist neighbors; between rich nations and poor; between small nations and large; between men whose skins are brown and black and yellow and white; between Hindus and Moslems and Buddhists and Christians.

It is a peace that can only be sustained through the durable bonds of peace: through international trade; through the free flow of people and ideas; through full participation by all nations in an international community under law; and through a common dedication to the great tasks of human progress and economic development.

Is such a peace possible?

With all my heart I believe it is. We are not there yet. We have a long way to journey. But the foundations for such a peace in Asia are being laid today as never before. They must be built on these essentials.

II

First is the determination of the United States to meet our obligations in Asia as a Pacific power.

You have heard arguments the other way. They are built on the old belief that "East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet."

They claim that we have no business but business interests in Asia; that Europe, not the Far East, is our proper "sphere of interest"; that our commitments in Asia are not worth the resources they require; that the ocean is vast, the cultures alien, the languages strange, and the races different.

These arguments have been tested, and found wanting.

They do not stand the test of geography: We are bounded not by one but two oceans—and whether by aircraft or ship, satellite or missile, the Pacific is as crossable as the Atlantic.

They do not stand the test of common sense: The economic network of this shrinking globe is too intertwined—the basic hopes of men are too related—and the possibility of common disaster is too real—for us to ignore threats to peace in Asia.

They do not stand the test of human concern: The people of Asia matter—we share with them a common humanity.

And they do not stand the test of reality: Asia is no longer sitting outside the door of the Twentieth Century. She is here, in the same world with us, to be either our partner or our problem.

Americans entered this century believing that our security had no foundation outside our own continent. Twice we mistook our sheltered position for safety. Twice we were wrong.

If we are wise now, we will not repeat our mistakes of the past. We will not retreat from the obligations of freedom and security in Asia.

The second essential for peace in Asia is to prove to aggressive nations that the use of force to conquer others is a losing game.

There is no more difficult task in a world of revolutionary change—where the rewards of conquest tempt ambitious appetites.

As long as the leaders of North Vietnam believe they can take over the people of South Vietnam by force, we must not let them succeed.

We must stand across their path and say: "You will not prevail. Turn from the use of force—and peace will follow."

Every American must know exactly what it is we are trying to do in Vietnam. Our greatest resource in this conflict—our greatest support for the men who are fighting there—is your understanding. It is your willingness to carry—perhaps for a long time—the burden of a confusing and costly war.

We are not trying to wipe out North Vietnam.

We are not trying to change their government.

We are not trying to establish permanent bases in South Vietnam.

And we are not trying to gain one inch of new territory.

Then why are we there?

Because we are trying to make the Communists of North Vietnam stop shooting at their neighbors.

Because we are trying to make their aggression unprofitable.

Because we are trying to demonstrate that guerrilla warfare, inspired by one nation against another, cannot succeed. Once that lesson is learned, a shadow that hangs over all of Asia will begin to recede.

When will that day come? I cannot tell you; only the men in Hanoi can determine the answer.

We are fighting a war of determination. It may last a long time. But we must keep on until the Communists in North Vietnam realize the price of aggression is too high—and either agree to a peaceful settlement or to end the fighting.

However long it takes, I want the Communists in Hanoi to know where we stand.

First, victory for your armies is impossible. You cannot drive us from South Vietnam by force. Do not mistake our firm stand for false optimism—as long as you persist in aggression, we will resist.

Second, the minute you realize that a military victory is out of the question, and turn from the use of force, you will find us ready to reciprocate. We want to end the fighting. We want to bring our men home. We want an honorable peace in Vietnam. In your hands is the key to that peace. You have only to turn it.

III

The third essential is the building of political and economic strength among the nations of free Asia.

For years they have been working at the task. And the untold story of 1966 is the story of what free Asians have done for themselves, and with the help of others, while South Vietnam and her allies have held aggression at bay.

Many of you can recall our faith in the future of Europe at the end of World War II. We backed that faith with all the aid and compassion we could muster.

Our faith in Asia today is just as great. And it is faith backed by reason. For if we stand firm in Vietnam against military conquest, we believe the emerging order of hope and progress in Asia will continue to grow.

Secretary Rusk has just returned from a trip through the Far East. He told me yesterday of many heartening signs as the people of Asia work toward common goals.

In the last year:

Japan and Korea have settled long-standing disputes and established normal relations with promise for closer cooperation;

One country after another has achieved rates of economic growth beyond the most optimistic hopes of a few years ago;

Indonesia has pulled back from the brink of Communism and economic collapse;

India and Pakistan—600 million strong—have ended a tragic conflict and returned to the immense work of peace;

Japan has become a dramatic example of economic progress through political and social freedom and has begun to help others;

Communist China's policy of aggression by proxy is failing;

Nine Pacific nations—allies and neutrals, white and colored—came together on their own initiative to form an Asian and Pacific Council;

New and constructive groupings for political and economic cooperation are under discussion in Southeast Asia;

The multibillion-dollar Asian Development Bank is moving forward in Manila with the participation of 31 nations;

And the development of Lower Mekong River Basin is going forward despite the war.

Throughout free Asia you can hear the echo of progress. As one Malaysian leader said: "Whatever our ethical, cultural, or religious background, the nations and peoples of Southeast Asia must pull together in the same broad sweep of history. We must create with our own hands and minds a new perspective and a new framework. And we must do it ourselves."

This is the new Asia that is taking shape behind our defense of South Vietnam. Because we have been firm—because we have committed ourselves to the defense of one small country—others have taken new heart.

We do not intend to let them down. Our word will be good.

IV

There is a fourth essential for peace in Asia which may seem the most difficult of all: reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies.

A peaceful mainland China is central to a peaceful Asia.

A hostile China must be discouraged from aggression. A misguided China must be encouraged toward understanding of the outside world and toward policies of peaceful cooperation.

For lasting peace can never come to Asia as long as the 700 million people of mainland China are isolated by their rulers from the outside world.

We have learned in our relations with other such states that the weakness of neighbors is a temptation and only firmness backed by power can deter power backed by ambition. But we have also learned that the greatest force for opening closed minds and closed societies is the free flow of ideas and people and goods.

For many years the United States has attempted in vain to persuade the Chinese Communists to agree to an exchange of newsmen as a first step to increased understanding.

More recently, we have taken steps to permit American scholars, experts in medicine and public health, and other specialists to travel to Communist China.

These initiatives have been rejected.

We persist because we know that hunger and disease, ignorance and poverty, recognize no boundaries of creed or class or country.

We persist because we believe that even the most rigid societies will one day awaken to the rich possibilities of a diverse world.

And we persist because we believe that cooperation, not hostility, is the way of the future.

That day is not yet here. It may be long in coming, but it is clearly on its way. And come it must.

Earlier this year the Foreign Minister of Singapore said that if the nations of the world could learn to build a truly world civilization in the Pacific through cooperation and peaceful competition, then—as Theodore Roosevelt remarked before him—this may be the greatest of all human eras—the Pacific Era.

As a Pacific power we must help achieve that outcome.

It is a goal worthy of our dreams and of the deeds of brave men.

I pledge to all those counting on us: we will do our part.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE McCLOSKEY BID ON THE U.S. MINT IN PHILADELPHIA

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, earlier this week I commented on the strange procedure followed by the General Services Administration in awarding a contract for the Philadelphia Mint to the McCloskey Co. I pointed out that 5 days after the bids had been submitted with a deadline of June 24 the McCloskey Co. was allowed to change its bid downward by about a half million dollars on the 18-month construction time period, and about $4 million on the 12-month period, bringing them below the previous low bidder.

Since that time the General Services Administration has insisted that this was their standard procedure and that I had misunderstood the bidding procedures, I am told that this was not exactly

a competitive bid arrangement but rather a combination negotiated-competitive bid.

I have stated earlier that I think I understand negotiated bids, and I think I understand competitive bids. However, this is certainly the first time in 20 years that it has been called to my attention that we have competitive-negotiated bid arrangements for awarding contracts on Government buildings.

In this instance the bids were received with a deadline for submission of all bids at a certain hour on the 24th of June. Three bids were submitted on that date. They were opened. There was no negotiation conducted. The GSA claims that they never talked to any of the bidders. They say that 5 days later, on June 29, completely unsolicited, McCloskey came into their office and revised its bid downward. They insist that this was done completely on an unsolicited basis. They say they then on June 29 placed two telephone calls, one to each of the competitors, to determine whether they wanted to stand pat, lower, or raise their bids. On July 1, 48 hours later they awarded the bid to the McCloskey Co., who was then, based on the revised bids, the low bidder.

If this really was a negotiated bid, it certainly was a strange procedure. Who were the people contacted? Bids are accepted; they are opened; the GSA waits in its office and does not talk to them; it just waits, hopes, and prays that by some strange medium the bidders will get the message that their bids were too high. The General Services Administration says that it never talked to any of the bidders until after it was approached by McCloskey. They just accepted the results that fate may present.

If this is the procedure followed by the department and they say this is the standard procedure—it is time that the results be examined. I am today asking the General Services Administration to submit to me a complete record of all contracts awarded for public buildings during the last 3 years, showing the original bids, a list of all negotiated-competitive bids, the procedure followed, and the ultimate bid, along with all change orders made later on the contracts. It is time for the Congress to see how this negotiated-competitive bid arrangement takes place and what the results are.

Mr. President, I have a letter just received from Mr. Knott, which I shall place in the RECORD. He released the letter to the press yesterday, and I first saw it in the newspapers; but I have it now, and I shall insert it in the RECORD. Mr. Knott pointed out that he was unable to get other bids from these contractors. That is true. I knew that because on April 7, 1966, there appeared this item in the Engineering News Record:

> No Bids At All.—The General Services Administration last week received no bids at all for the superstructure of the $18-million U.S. Mint under way in Philadelphia. McCloskey & Co., of Philadelphia, holds the substructure contract. GSA officials said seven or eight companies took out plans and specifications. Now GSA seeks an answer to the absolute lack of interest in the superstructure phase.

I think that the General Services Administration should have an answer to that question. I pointed out earlier that it costs contractors considerable money to prepare a bid, and they want to know if they are going to be given equal consideration.

In the letter which I shall place in the RECORD, and which has been released to the press, Mr. Knott stated as follows. I received this letter this morning and will read one sentence.

> You may have had doubts about the matter, but surely it is significant that they are not, to my knowledge shared by any of the other contractors, either with respect to the procedure or the result.

Mr. President, Mr. Knott may think that he is right on that, but he should examine the records because he has had serious complaints. There were complaints to Mr. Knott's office. I shall read one letter.

First, I should go back to the beginning of the contract on this project and outline the procedure followed. It is well for all contractors in America bidding on Government buildings and Congress to understand how contracts will now be awarded. We are now told that this is standard procedure under the Administration, and therefore it is well that we all understand how this negotiated-competitive bidding arrangement works on the Potomac front.

First, we go back to the beginning of the first contract on the mint last year, at which time they solicited bids for the contract on the substructure. This substructure contract was awarded to the McCloskey Co. of Philadelphia on October 1, 1965, in the amount of $2,724,000 with a contract time of 180 days from the date of the receipt of the notice to proceed. The contract was awarded on a sealed-bid basis, McCloskey being the low bidder among seven bidders.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter from Mr. Knott dated July 29, with the attachments showing the change orders, be printed in the RECORD, along with the list of the seven bids. This report shows that the first contract was not completed until June 17, 1966, while the contract date was April 3, 1966.

This represents a 2½-month delay, which becomes significant when I read some of the letters and comments of other contractors at that time.

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

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your letter of June 29, 1966, regarding the two construction contracts at the U.S. Mint at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The substructure contract was awarded to McCloskey and Company of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on October 1, 1965, in the amount of $2,724,000, with a contract time of 180 days from date of receipt of notice to proceed. This contract was awarded on a sealed bid basis, the McCloskey firm being the low bidder in a field of 7 bidders. The original contract completion date was April 3, 1966, and the work was substantially completed on June 17, 1966. The contractor's request for an extension of time of 75 days because of additional work, strikes, etc., is now being reviewed.

Enclosed is a list of 43 contract modifications that have been issued by the Government together with the estimated cost of each one. They are now being reviewed by our estimators for reasonableness.

Original contract price	$2,724,000
Estimated net cost of changes	81,770
Estimated final price	2,805,770

The superstructure contract was awarded as a result of limited competition between McCloskey and Company, J. W. Bateson and Company, and Turner Construction Company to McCloskey and Company on July 1, 1966, in amount of $12,682,586 to be completed in 548 days. Less than 1% of the work has been completed to date at the site as the contractor did not start until July 11, 1966.

Thank you for your continued interest in this project.

Sincerely yours,

LAWSON B. KNOTT, Jr.,
Administrator.

Enclosure.

Pending change orders, U.S. mint, Philadelphia, Pa.

Change order No.	Description	Estimated contract credit	Estimated contract addition
1	Provides trailer for construction engineer's office in lieu of constructing an office	$1,170	
2	Remove unsuitable material near column 4 and backfill with select material		$3,750
3	Reduce thickness of basement floormat	46,770	
4	Remove unsuitable material along Arch St. and backfill with select material		4,950
5	Add water service to building along 4th St		350
6	Revise opening for ventilation duct as shown on field drawing No. 1		275
7	Revise type E columns as shown on field drawing No. 2		205
8	Revise escalator opening as shown on field drawing No. 3		35
9	Revise dimensions of sump pit as shown on field drawing No. 9		$9,285
10	Delete dovetail anchors and add blockouts for mechanical duct		1,895
11	Add blockouts as shown on field drawing No. 4		240
12	Revise elevator shaft located near stair No. 2 as shown on field drawing No. 5		90
13	Provide blockout in elevator wall as shown on field drawing No. 6		685
14	Omit slab for future equipment	$3,775	
15	Remove excess fill at telephone duct		3,700
16	Provide blockouts 1st floor as shown on field drawing No. 10		225

Pending change orders, U.S. mint, Philadelphia, Pa.—Continued

Change order No.	Description	Estimated contract credit	Estimated contract addition
17	Revise stairways as shown on field drawings Nos. 11 and 12		$250
18	Remove rubble of demolition		4,055
19	Increase load-bearing capacity of 1st floor as shown on A series drawings. This change required by U.S. Mint for the installation of special machinery		78,000
20	Delete angle guards and miscellaneous materials	$385	
21	Revisions to columns as shown on field drawing No. 13		780
22	Add anchor slots for future granite face, 1st floor		410
23	Add support for telephone duct as shown on field drawing No. 15		750
24	Add concrete ledge to support granite face as shown on field drawing No. 16		185
25	Provide 18-inch concrete slab in lieu of 10-inch slab at south elevator No. 3		150
26	Revisions to soil pipe (drains) as shown on field drawing No. 17		810
27	Delete piers and anchor bolts in the scale pit in accord with field drawing No. 18	230	
28	Add inserts and make revisions to drainage piping as shown on field drawing No. 19		1,000
29	Extend concrete fireproofing		855
30	Add door and frame as shown on field drawing No. 21		250
31	Add opening in floor slab as shown on field drawing No. 20		165
32	Additional lumber purchased to avoid stoppage of work due to truckdrivers strike of 6½ weeks		14,000
33	Delete concrete as reflected by field drawing No. 22	$750	
34	Add blockouts in concrete as shown on field drawing No. 23		$65
35	Provide wall blockouts as shown on field drawing No. 24		35
36	Omit sleeves, etc., at column line EF and 15	0	0
37	Remove unsuitable material at footings D-9, A-14, A-15, B-15, and D-10 and backfill with select material		500
38	Omit drain, gratings, and pipes as shown on detail 1 on drawing 9-P-8A	1,500	
39	Remove unsuitable material at footings D-12/12.1 and D-13		250
40	Remove unsuitable material at footings E-14, D-15, and C-16 and backfill with select material		255
41	Remove unsuitable rubble along 4th St. sidewalk and backfill with select material		1,500
42	Because of interference, relocate conduit along column line 17		400
43	Change contract requirements from regular cement to high early cement to overcome progress lag because of strike of the drivers of concrete trucks, not to exceed		6,000
	Total	54,580	136,350
	Total estimated contract credit		54,580
	Net additions		81,770

Bids for substructure, U.S. mint, Philadelphia, Pa.

	Completion in 9 months	Completion in 6 months
Company A	$2,700,000	$2,724,000
Company B	2,719,000	2,969,000
Company C	2,862,995	3,266,995
Company D	2,994,600	(1)
Company E	3,115,000	3,415,000
Company F	3,291,000	3,543,000
Company G	3,270,600	3,870,600

[1] No bid.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for such additional time as may be necessary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, after this first contract for the substructure was awarded on the 1st of October I received several complaints as to the manner in which this contract had been awarded.

I shall read excerpts from some of the letters that I received complaining about the manner in which the contract was handled at that time.

I shall first read from a letter which arrived in my office under date of November 1. I shall omit the name of the contractor because, after all, these contractors do not want to get into trouble with the General Services Administration.

I have personally contacted the administrator, Mr. Lawson Knott, and pointed out the fact that it was evident to all the bidders that McCloskey & Company were protecting themselves in case they were underbid on the basic proposal.

In the meantime, I have also talked with Bethlehem Steel Company, who are furnishing the steel for the project, and they admit that the earliest possible delivery date is between four and a half and five months, and with a month for erection of the steel, there would be no time left for completing the balance of the work; whereas, it would require the best contractor to spend at least three months on the installation of concrete before the building could be turned over to the government.

Mr. President, I might say that on this particular proposal, McCloskey & Co. had bid $2,724,000 for completion in 6 months and $2,700,000 for completion in 9 months.

An examination of the seven bids received shows that all of the bidders took the position that it was physically impossible to complete this building in 6 months. I understand that there was a penalty of around $3,500 per day for any day over, and recognizing that it could not be completed in 6 months the other 6-month bids ranged from $200,000 to $300,000 higher than the 9-month base. This would give them a chance to include as part of the cost of the contract the penalties that would be charged for the inevitable delay. This was true in all contracts except the McCloskey contract, in which there was a difference of only $24,000.

I read again excerpts from a letter received November 1, 1965, from one of these bidders:

I have personally contacted the administrator, Mr. Lawson Knott, and pointed out the fact that it was evident to all the bidders that McCloskey & Company were protecting themselves in case they were underbid on the basic proposal.

In the meantime, I have also talked with Bethlehem Steel Company, who are furnishing the steel for the project, and they admit that the earliest possible delivery date is between four and a half and five months, and with a month for erection of the steel, there would be no time left for completing the balance of the work; whereas, it would require the best contractor to spend at least three months on the installation of concrete before the building could be turned over to the government.

In other words, this contractor is pointing out the physical impossibility of completing the contract in 6 months.

Mr. President, I read from another letter written by one of the bidders. This letter was not addressed to me, although I did receive a copy of it. It was addressed to the editor of the Philadelphia Inquirer, not as a letter to the editor, but as one outlining the general background of how this Government project was being handled in Philadelphia. It was written by one of the recognized and responsible contractors accepted by the GSA as a bidder. I am not quoting it out of turn, because this letter to the Inquirer makes a note of the fact that:

I might mention that I am sending a copy of this letter to Senator WILLIAMS in Washington.

Thus, I am not betraying any confidence when I quote excerpts from the letter, again withholding the name of the contractor.

Nevertheless, this letter shows that there were complaints on the manner in which the bidding procedure was handled. Notwithstanding what Mr. Knott now states, there were complaints from other contractors, and Mr. Knott knew it.

Our firm submitted a proposal in connection with foundation work on the new United States Mint to be erected in Philadelphia.

The General Services Administration had requested that the bids be submitted on two bases: #1 Bid, the cost to complete the project in nine months, a period they thought reasonable; #2 Bid, the cost to complete the project in a period of six months.

All contractors submitting bids were of the opinion that it was a physical impossibility to complete the work in any period less than eight to nine months. This was due primarily to the fact that there was a substantial amount of structural steel involved in the project, and the steel companies contended the earliest possible date for delivery of this material was between four and a half to five months. There was at least three and a half months work required to complete the project after the steel had been delivered.

I am enclosing a tabulation of the bids for the work to be completed in nine months, and also a tabulation for the work to be completed in six months.

I think it is obvious to anyone reviewing these figures that McCloskey's bid was a dishonest one, and based on the fact that if he was not low bidder on the original bid he would obtain the contract through the alternate bid.

This type of bidding on projects by the McCloskey firm, in my opinion, is not only dishonest but also despicable. Not only our firm but all the other firms in Philadelphia, Washington and other cities, have suffered at the hands of the McCloskey Company because of McCloskey's political contacts and associations.

Regarding the Mint project, it is my intention to make an appointment with the Administrator of the General Services Administration in Washington and discuss this issue. It is also my intention to prove that I am not seeking the job, and to offer him the opportunity of disregarding my bid.

To me, this issue is of vast importance and I abhor such dishonesty on the part of the McCloskey firm. Over the years, I have encountered so many cases where I felt I had been treated shabbily only because of the McCloskey influence in not only the federal government but also the state and municipality.

He attached a P.S. to his letter, which is dated October 1, 1965, the very day the contract was awarded:

Recently, we were awarded a contract on a job three weeks after the time the bids were submitted, and as a rule, it requires at least this period of time. However, I learned this morning that McCloskey already has his shovel on the job and is removing old foundation walls.

Mr. President, the comments by these contractors are on the mint project. They indicate that the McCloskey firm was on the job the day the bids were opened. This certainly is strange mind-reading to be so sure of the subcontract, just as this company was able to know that its bids on the superstructure, as submitted June 24, were too high. In this latter instance, with no one contacting him, we are told that it was his superintelligence that caused him to come in 5 days later and just happen to submit new bids which were lower than the previous low bid.

The complaint which I have just outlined was also made to the General Services Administration.

Let me quote another letter written by another contractor. He, too, was a bidder on this first contract on the substructure for the mint. His letter is dated October 27, 1965.

I read the letter for the RECORD because it is worth noting:

OCTOBER 27, 1965.

U.S. GOVERNMENT GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention of Mr. Lawson B. Knott).

GENTLEMEN: On September 30, 1965, we submitted a proposal for the substructure of the United States Mint located at 5th & Arch Streets, Philadelphia. Two proposals were required, one to complete the job in 270 calendar days, and the second to complete the job in 180 calendar days with a $3500.00 a day penalty under each alternate.

Mr. President, before I proceed further, let me point out that this letter was not written to me but to the Administrator of General Services Administration.

How can Mr. Knott reconcile this with his letter of today wherein he states that to his knowledge none of the other contractors had ever raised any question with respect to the manner in which the contract had been handled?

I continue reading from the letter which was sent to his own department under date of October 27, 1965.

According to the newspapers in our territory, there has been appropriated $21,000,000.00 and it is claimed that this money was appropriated without a thorough investigation and that it would cost $2,000,000.00 a month for every month that this Mint is not in operation. That being the case, it certainly would appear to leave the General Services Administration no alternative but to accept the 180 day bid, especially in view of the negligible difference between the low bidder's alternate prices.

It is needless to say that the cost of bidding this work is tremendous to every contractor that submits a bid and the least that we can expect, even though we are not low bidder, is equal bidding conditions.

It has always been the ruling of any government agency that we worked for that before work could be started insurance certificates had to be issued, a Performance Bond furnished, plans for sheathing, shoring, etc., submitted for approval, the contract signed and then a notice to proceed issued. In this particular case the low bidder started the job on October 1, 1965. Normally it takes considerably more than one day for the formalities required by your Department. Being able to start work, at this time of the year with the winter approaching, the day after a job is bid, is a tremendous advantage that a contractor would have over the other bidders. They could beat the winter by 30 days, which it would normally take to get a job of this size awarded and a notice to proceed. If this procedure was in order, it should have been made known to all bidders so that their bids could have been based accordingly.

There may have been a possibility that your Department did all of this in one day, but if you did it is very irregular. However, that means the completion date of this contract would be approximately April 1, 1966, and that being the case, then we assure shoring plans were submitted and approved that would meet the requirements of the Penna. Dept. of Labor & Industry and the City of Philadelphia, and permission from the City to excavate beyond the property lines and their requirements for backfill signed, and of course your specifications called for the listing of all subcontractors to be used on the site as a requirement of the bidding. If all of these things have been done and the job done in accordance with the rules and regulations as set forth above, it might be that we have no complaint. But if not, then we feel that in this instance, the low bidder had an advantage that we did not have, and we feel that it is our duty to protect our own business to make sure that the job is carried out in accordance with the terms of the contract and that all contractors bidding your work have the same bidding conditions.

Mr. President, on the contract for this substructure the low bidder, the McCloskey firm, apparently started the job on October 1, 1965. That is also the date the bids were opened and announced.

This letter was sent to Mr. Knott, General Services Administrator, on October 27, and if I understand the English language it does represent dissatisfaction.

I have quoted from letters from contractors who bid on the first substructure. These contractors who were bidders on the substructure indicate in their letters that they were thoroughly dissatisfied with the way the contract was handled, and it is significant that not one of them submitted a bid on the superstructure. That will explain to the General Services Administration why the Administration could not get the bids from general contractors on the superstructure. Other contractors did not think they were being treated fairly. I have talked to many of them. They saw no need in wasting thousands of dollars preparing bids for contracts they knew they could not get. This contract from the beginning has been handled in a highly unsatisfactory procedure.

This is neither a competitive bid nor a negotiated contract. What negotiations are they talking about? The General Services Administration says it did not contact a single company. With whom was General Services negotiating? How did Mr. McCloskey get the strange message that he was not the low bidder and that it would be necessary to change his bids? How was it that this bidding was not handled properly in the first place? Last October when the bids were opened on the substructure, it was found that McCloskey was the low bidder, and we are told that he was on the job working on the same day that the bids were opened. This is remarkable even under the Great Society.

There were no negotiations of that contract. I say the contractors are justified in their complaints. If this is the procedure followed by the Administration, the whole procurement procedures of the General Services Administration should be reexamined by Congress.

Based on this record I can understand the reluctance of bidders to compete for the last contract. They did not have a chance.

The General Services Administration is not going to obtain successful competitive bidding by contractors until they are assured of equal and fair treatment and until they know there will not be any of this backstage finagling that has obviously happened in this particular case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter which I have just received from Mr. Knott, dated August 23, 1966.

In this letter Mr. Knott tries to justify GSA's position on this case, but I want the record clear—I do not agree with his explanations.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, August 23, 1966.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: By my letters of July 29, August 8 and August 12, 1966, I attempted to answer your questions concerning the award of a contract to McCloskey and Company for construction of the Philadelphia Mint. In view of your statements on the floor of the Senate yesterday it seems apparent that you do not understand the essential difference between procurement by competitive bids and procurement by negotiation. Let me therefore attempt to rectify this misunderstanding by providing a rather detailed review of the steps leading to the award of the contract.

The basic relevant fact is GSA's general policy to seek competitive bids. Only where such circumstances as urgency make this

course impracticable do we turn to negotiated procurement. The award of contracts for the Philadelphia Mint illustrates both courses. We in fact first sought competitive bids and only when we were unable to secure them for a major phase of the project did we turn to negotiated procurement.

Accelerated construction of the Philadelphia Mint was authorized by Public Law 89-81, Act of July 23, 1965, 79 Stat. 254. In accordance with the basic enabling act Public Law 88-102 approved August 20, 1963, 77 Stat. 129, GSA acting for the Treasury Department obtained bids and awarded contracts. The Treasury Department urged GSA to act swiftly because of the urgency the Treasury Department attached to this project.

So as to take advantage of time which would otherwise be lost while total plans for the entire project were being completed GSA planned to contract for construction in four phases as the design for each was completed. Bids were called for first on Phase I, and seven bids were received. The lowest was submitted by McCloskey and Company, which was therefore awarded the contract last September 30.

While Phase I (Substructure) was under construction, the plans for Phase II (Superstructure) were completed and competitive bids were invited for that phase on March 9, 1966. *No bids* were received in response to this invitation.

The plans for Phase IV (Elevators, Escalators, Loading Ramps and Truck Scale) were completed next and competitive bids were called for. Two bids were received:

McCloskey & Co.	$415,565
Otis Elevator Co.	417,726

In other words, McCloskey submitted the lowest competitive bid on this Phase also.

During this period, Treasury Department officials met with GSA officials to seek the most expeditious manner of construction of Phases II, III, and IV. In view of its urgent need for the new Mint and of the failure to receive any competitive bids on Phase II, the Treasury Department recommended that—

The remaining work be incorporated into a single package;

GSA seek proposals—as contrasted to bids—from contractors as a basis for negotiations;

And that alternate proposals be solicited—one set for completion within 12 months and a second set for completion within 18 months.

GSA followed these recommendations, acting under Public Law 89-81 and in full accord with applicable regulations (FPR 1-3.804, 1-3.805-1(a) and 1-3.805-1(b); FPR 1-3.215; see 41 CFR). In the meantime, plans for Phase III (Finishing and Outfitting) had been completed and the bids on Phase IV, for which McCloskey was the low bidder, were allowed to lapse.

In soliciting proposals, GSA sought both to interest contractors who had submitted prior bids and other contractors as well. Proposals were sought from McCloskey Company, Fuller Company, Turner Construction Company, J. W. Bateson and Company, and the McShain Company.

The McShain Company and the Fuller Company declined to submit proposals. This left three firms interested in submitting proposals, which *unlike competitive bids*, were to serve as the starting point for negotiations.

By last June 24, the following initial proposals for the combined work in Phases II, III, and IV had been received:

	12-month completion	*18-month completion*
McCloskey	$17,195,834.50	$13,227,565.00
Bateson	13,811,000.00	12,780,000.00
Turner	(1)	14,160,000.00

[1] No proposal.

Each firm's proposals were, as is required under the negotiated procurement procedure, not disclosed to the rival firms.

The next step, negotiation, was then to begin, based on these initial proposals and in accord with 41 CFR Section 1-3.805-1(a), which states:

"After receipt of initial proposals, written or oral discussions shall be conducted with all responsible offerors who submitted proposals within a competitive range, price and other factors considered."

On June 29, however, before GSA invited the three firms to engage in such discussions, Thomas McCloskey delivered to us revised written proposals of $13,093,565.00 for 12-month completion and $12,682,565.00 for 18-month completion.

In view of this revised proposal and the relevant regulations, on the same day we contacted officials of the other two firms to determine whether they wished to revise their proposals. The J. W. Bateson Company declined to submit a revised proposal, stating it preferred to stand on its original proposal. Its local representative explained this decision in a meeting on the same day, June 29, with a GSA official. The Turner Construction Company did submit a revised proposal of $13,885,000.00 for 18-month completion. It should be noted, at this point, that just as none of the companies had from GSA any knowledge of the content of the other original proposals, neither did any of the companies have such knowledge of the content of the revised proposals until the award of the contract was subsequently announced. Acting upon a Treasury Department recommendation to contract on an 18-month basis GSA then awarded the contract to McCloskey, since its revised proposal was the lowest revised proposal received.

In short, GSA acted under procedures which are standard whenever contracts are subject to negotiation and under provisions known to all the interested contractors. All contractors had equal opportunity to submit proposals and to revise them as they saw fit. You may have had doubts about the matter, but surely it is significant that they are not, to my knowledge shared by any of the other contractors, either with respect to the procedures or the result.

Should this letter not suffice, I would be pleased to discuss the matter with you further in person, for I emphatically believe that any suggestion of impropriety in this matter is inaccurate, does a disservice to the General Services Administration and its employees, and should be withdrawn.

Sincerely yours,

LAWSON B. KNOTT, Jr.,
Administrator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest to Mr. Knott that he reexamine his files for that; there have been complaints from those who have been bidding on this project.

I can understand the reluctance of the contractors to come forward and make any statements since they are potential bidders on future Government contracts. They do not want to get out of favor by going on record with complaints about the way the General Services Administration has handled this contract. However, I am complaining about the manner in which these contracts have been handled and am not stopping at this point. I am today requesting that the General Services Administration furnish a record of every Government contract for every project that has been handled by that agency in the last 3 years. With this report I want all the information and data in connection with such bidding, the dates, the change orders, and a record of any changed bids. I want this report to include a record of the negotiation contracts, competitive bids, and the new brand of negotiated-competitive bids. Then we can determine whether this new competitive-negotiated formula with a Texas twist is really in the interest of the American taxpayers. In my opinion, it is not.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I notice the Senator from Texas rising and I withhold that request.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I rose to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in connection with my previous remarks, I overlooked mentioning one point which is very important. After the awarding of the first contract on a 6-month-construction-time basis, in the face of the warning to the General Services Administration by the other contractors that the contract could not be completed within 6 months, we find that they were right. The contract on the substructure was not completed on April 1. I point out that those contractors were right in their warnings that it would be physically impossible to do so. The contract was not completed in 6 months. Quite to the contrary, it ran over about 75 days. Instead of being completed in 6 months, or April 1, as originally bid, the work was not completed until June 17 of this year. Therefore, the penalty clause in the contract should be effective. If the General Services Administration enforces this contract, it should collect from McCloskey a penalty of between $200,000 to $300,000.

I have been advised that they have been negotiating on this point, but the understanding is that the penalty may not be enforced. Why? Other contractors were bound by these rules. This first contract had been awarded on the basis that the construction would be completed within 6 months from October 1, 1965. As the result now stands with the change orders allowed, unless this penalty is strictly enforced, it will mean the contract was not awarded to the lowest bidder, since it was not completed on time.

Mr. Knott has already said he saw no reason for complaint for this overrunning. This was a most generous gesture, but unless this rule is enforced, I will expect an explanation.

The Wall Street Journal has referred to it as a competitive-negotiated bid authorized by the Treasury Department, and said the rush was because it was so important that the construction be completed at an early date. If that is true, I am sure the Administration will be diligent in assessing the penalty of $3,500 a day as provided by the penalty clause for McCloskey's failure to complete the contract by April 1 as agreed. This penalty

for each day's delay should be collected from the McCloskey Co. I will be following their efforts to see just how much is actually collected.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PROBLEMS OF WATER SUPPLY FOR WEST TEXAS, PROPOSED FIREARMS LEGISLATION, AND OTHER PROBLEMS BEFORE CONGRESS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the West Texas Press Association, meeting in San Angelo recently for its 36th annual convention, adopted several resolutions which I would like to have inserted in the RECORD.

As Senators will note, they are concerned with the problems of water supply for west Texas, firearms legislation, and other significant problems before the two Houses of Congress.

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

RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY WEST TEXAS PRESS ASSOCIATION AT 36TH ANNUAL CONVENTION IN SAN ANGELO, AUGUST 6, 1966

Whereas, the future of West Texas is linked with the continuing assurance of an adequate supply of fresh water for municipal, industrial and agricultural use, and

Whereas, provisions thus far made for future water supplies would appear inadequate for many areas of our region, and

Whereas, it would appear that any long-range solution for our area of the state must provide for interstate supply from distant sources: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Texas Water Resources Board be urged to give further and additional study to the problems of West Texas, and that every encouragement be given to those interested in long-range study and plans for importation of water from out-of-state, with particular commendation to Congressman RICHARD C. WHITE and Congressman GEORGE MAHON for their efforts to obtain a study of the problem by the Bureau of Reclamation, and be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be provided all our West Texas members of Congress, our United States senators, and others in position to further this project.

Whereas, legislation which is enacted in haste without the benefit of deliberation, meditation and consideration is frequently passed through emotional feelings, and

Whereas, constitutional guarantees and rights have stood for decades with purposeful and useful meaning; therefore, be it

Resolved by members of the West Texas Press Association, That we request the President of the United States, the members of Congress and the state government to use caution in enacting legislation which would restrict the right of an American citizen to own and to bear fire arms.

Whereas, there is now much confusion in the interpretation of wage and hour laws as related to coverage of employees in office supply and clerical positions, and

Whereas, the smaller office supply stores, operated independently, and the small newspapers enjoy exemption from these laws on an individual basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we label as ridiculous the interpretations of law which hold an employee of these two exempt businesses when combined are no longer exempt, and request that the law be amended to extend the exemption enjoyed by the separate businesses to those operated as combined businesses.

Whereas, 83,000 acres of West Texas land is being lost to acute mesquite infestation annually and mesquite and brush eradication has become one of the most urgent needs in West Texas, additional emphasis needs to be placed on the problem from an area standpoint: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That West Texas Press Association lend its efforts, collectively and individually, toward adequate research on a West Texas basis, on a local level, recognizing the peculiarities of our West Texas climate and terrain.

Whereas, talking about these things and doing nothing about them will gain nothing: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the secretary be instructed to send copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, the Governor of Texas, and members of Congress and the state government for their consideration.

WEST TEXAS PRESS ASSOCIATION.

(Resolutions committee: George Baker, Fort Stockton, Texas; Francis Perry, Ballinger, Texas.)

(Retiring president, Neil Vanzant, Seagraves, Texas; incoming president, Bob Craig, Hamlin, Texas; Sec.-Treas. Mrs. R. F. Mahood, Perryton, Texas.)

INFLATION NOT CAUSED BY FARMERS OR FOOD PRICES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, thousands of words have been spoken about inflation and the causes of it, particularly during the past year, when the Nation has been beset by a record inflationary spiral which is eating up wages, profits, and retirement income at the rate of nearly an additional half of 1 percent a month.

Today I want to say just a few words about one facet of the problem.

I call to the attention of this body and the American people one of the facts that did not receive a great deal of attention in the Labor Department's consumer price index report carried in the press yesterday.

The New York Times, noting that consumer prices continued their steady rise in July and now have reached 2.8 percent above the level a year ago, made this statement:

> Although higher food prices have captured the national spotlight, a special analysis today showed that prices of a wide range of services had accounted for almost half of the rise in the price index in the last 12 months. Food accounted for only one-quarter of the rise.

This last sentence, Mr. President, is a point that should set the record straight. You and I have known all along that farm prices are not causing the terrible inflation gripping this Nation. Now, Mr. President, we have additional evidence that food prices are not the primary factor responsible for the consumer price spiral.

Neither the farmer nor the food industry are responsible for the high cost of living. It is Government policies that are to blame.

I want to point this out, Mr. President, so that people looking for a scapegoat can look elsewhere—not at the farmers—to point the finger of shame.

PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, yesterday I announced my intention to place daily in the RECORD, for the assistance of Senators, copies of testimony given on the proposed school prayer resolution pending before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments.

For those who may have missed reading the statements inserted yesterday, they may be found at pages 20295–20297 of the August 23, 1966 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two additional statements received by the subcommittee.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF REV. ROBERT MCNEILL, BREAM MEMORIAL CHURCH, CHARLESTON, W. VA., PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE DIRKSEN COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PERMIT PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

At its 1964 General Assembly the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. (commonly called Southern) passed the following action regarding the Supreme Court decision concerning prayer and Bible reading in public schools:

(1) "We hold that the state should not impose religion in any of its expressions upon its citizens. The recent court decisions, overruling state laws requiring Bible reading and the Lords Prayer are therefore in our judgment theologically sound. (2) We hold however, that until the law is further clarified, that under circumstances not yet considered by the court, religious ceremonies can be held in public schools on a permissive, voluntary basis without violation of conscience. There is a valid distinction between the state's compelling its constituents to gather for a religious ceremony, and the state's permitting those who have gathered to acknowledge a higher power and to invoke a blessing upon their corporate life in a way generally and prudently agreed upon by them."

The General Assembly further recommended:

"That in consistence without understanding of recent Supreme Court decisions, our constituent membership in local communities, encourage school authorities and public officials to permit students to engage in some form of voluntary devotional recognition of God; and that in the arrangement of such an exercise the governing factor shall be prudence, goodwill, fairness, and affection."

At its 1965 General Assembly our church gave the following answer to an overture requesting endorsement of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to allow voluntary Bible Reading and Prayer in Public Schools:

"Because it is unwise to give support to a constitutional amendment which has not been written or submitted either to Congress or to the respective states for approval; and because the 1964 General Assembly affirmed

clearly the basic principles of our denomination [the overture is answered in the negative]"

From this point on I am departing from the exact wording of the General Assembly but am drawing certain inferences from the above statements and from the body of the full report from which these statements were taken.

(1) The General Assembly in 1965 did not at that time deem a constitutional amendment necessary, anticipating that the Supreme Court would further clarify the permissive aspect of school devotionals. Such clarification has not occurred and the result has been that many school principals have taken a rigid, absolutist position against any kind of religious expression on school premises. This has tended to insulate education even from the ethical implications of our pluralistic religious culture. Since then, of course, a specific amendment has been submitted to the Congress, which puts our 1965 pronouncement in a different light.

(2) There are certain geographical areas in our country, a cove in West Virginia for example, where the issue before us is not even a moot question. The people are homogeneous, ethnically and religiously. No Jews, Unitarians, Muslims, or Atheists are to be found there. School teachers testify that the use of prayer and Bible reading is a definite means of establishing order, authority, and decent conduct.

(3) We can envision in a city school, where the population is heterogeneous and the religion is pluralistic, a system of devotions whereby those of different faiths can enrich each other's lives by petitioning the God as they know him, according to their religious orientation, whether they be Jewish, Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Unitarian, Pentecostal, or whatever. Our American heritage has been one of vast cultural exchange within our own bounds. Why suppress such an exchange of religious values and concepts in our common institutions of learning?

For example, the press secretary of our senatorial committee chairman is Jewish and I have eaten several meals in his home. He offers a table blessing of his own faith and in the original Hebrew language. When he aks me to offer thanks I do so in the name of Christ. Each of us feels that the other has invoked the richest blessings from the deepest well-springs of his own heart for the other and his household. Neither of us withholds what he counts to be his profoundest understanding of the deity on the basis of some quasi-constitutional or social nicety. What can be done in our homes can also be done in our schools, which in many of our localities are not just a miscellaneous collection of impersonal beings but very livable, family-like institutions.

With our distinguished colleagues here who differ with this point of view we share an affectionate concern even for the minority of one who has not had and does not intend to have any religious indoctrination at all. But we hold that in such a hypothetical situation as above described where prayers and readings of many faiths are offered, say through the school's inter-communications system, no overt response is required, neither by bowed head nor sitting or standing at attention. And no one can make captive one's covert response.

A case in point is the celebrated *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 US 624–671) which was decided on the basis of the First and Fourteenth Amendments. Barnette's child had been compelled to salute the flag in the regular ceremony of pledging allegiance to it, although he was a member of the Jehovah's Witness sect. The court ruled in favor of Barnette, concluding that "if there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein." The point is that although the student was not required to consent overtly to the ceremony he was not excused from the exercise nor was the exercise abolished to keep from infringing upon his personal rights. We are not speaking of majority versus minority rights here (we refuse to invoke this argument in so delicate a matter as the human conscience) but we are underscoring the individual's capacity for stubborn rejection of any mere words which repel him even if they be addressed to some universal deity. In this he can maintain the integrity of his personal opinion.

In reviewing the Supreme Court's arguments on this issue we are assured by at least one of the justices that their decision does not portend the abolition of coin inscriptions, military chaplaincy, and prayers in Congress.

As for the latter he declares in effect that Congress and the school room are not analogous because of two factors, maturity and escapability. I had occasion once to offer the prayer before the Senate. I can only presume the senators' maturity but I can attest to their escapability. Like Elijah who was being pursued by Jezebel, I felt like exclaiming, "I even I only, plus the president pro-tem and the loyal West Virginia Senator RANDOLPH, am left."

We contend that the two are analogous, that the average student has a capacity for mental escapability that matches that of your most frequent habitue of the senatorial cloak room, that if prayers must be denied our schools they must be denied our Congress. All facetiousness aside, the distinctions the Court has drawn between the school and other social institutions seem to us extremely tenuous.

(4) While commending the Supreme Court for its efforts to prevent the establishment of a national religion or giving preference to one religion or denomination over another, even in one local community of our nation, and while commending the Court, too, for allowing religion to be taught as literature or history, we feel there is much more danger of favoritism, monopoly, and sectarian indoctrination inherent in such permissive teaching than in the offering of prayer which seldom reveals any sectarian identity.

(5) We believe it significant that in 1964 the Supreme Court declined to review a New York State decision that the Constitution was not violated by the presence of "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag, when recited without compulsion in public schools. Here is a phrase which is essentially a religious affirmation neatly tucked into a patriotic ceremony. Advocates of voluntary school prayers show much more restraint in that they request no affirmation nor commitment from anyone at all. The fact that the pledge is voluntary does not resolve the problem which the Supreme Court itself has raised, namely, what to do with the child who is urged to stand with his classmates and participate in this ceremony when he does not believe that this "one nation, indivisible" is under God. He can refrain from standing, he can skip the "under God," but he is subject to more psychological compulsion and duress from his classmates in this ceremony than from a religious devotional that calls for no affirmative response.

In this statement three types of devotionals have been discussed:

The first is mandatory on the part of the State, the form of which might or might not be prescribed, depending upon the particular State. Rightfully, this has been voided.

The second is a type that might be nonmandatory on the part of the State or even the local school authorities, which by its nature calls for some overt response or sign of participation. This we do not recommend.

The third is a type which seeks to incorporate the religious aspirations of all its constituents, designed neither to offend nor to neutralize any particular faith, and which calls for no overt response or gestures of participation.

If by Supreme Court decision or congressional action, it can be clarified that this third type is permissible, we see no necessity for a constitutional amendment. If such clarification is not or cannot be made by either of these two methods, then based upon the decision of our General Assembly of 1964 I believe it to be the concensus of the Presbyterian Church U.S. (whom I do not represent officially) that it favors a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayers in the public schools.

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS OF THE U.S. SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE BY C. EMANUEL CARLSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, BAPTIST JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS, AUGUST 2, 1966

My name is C. Emanuel Carlson. I am the Executive Director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, whose offices are here in Washington.

I appreciate that Chairman BAYH and the members of the Subcommittee are taking the time to go into this matter of the adequacy of the First Amendment. We are deeply indebted to all who have helped to give the public spotlight to these issues so that the masses of the American people have the opportunity of becoming knowledgeable about the proposals. If the time should ever come when an adjustment is necessary in the fundamental law that guarantees the religious freedom of the American people, such proposals will merit not only extended debate in this Subcommittee, but also prolonged study and discussion by all the people. We are glad that you have not taken the proposals lightly, or attempted to rush through some emotional expression of grievance. We, too, have sought to be deliberate on the issues, and to make it possible for our churches and people to confront the ideas. Before dealing with the substance of our problem, permit me to explain something of the nature and the work of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs.

The Joint Committee on Public Affairs consists of responsible representatives from seven Baptist conventions or conferences in the United States: Southern Baptist Convention, American Baptist Convention, National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., National Baptist Convention of America, Baptist General Conference, North American Baptist General Conference, Seventh Day Baptist General Conference.

Each convention chooses its own delegation according to its own by-laws. Those conventions which number more than one million members may send a committee of fifteen, and smaller conventions send smaller delegations. The customary pattern is for the convention to include its president, its chief executive official, a number of executives from its major agencies, and pastors and laymen to complete the group.

The purpose of the Joint Committee is to discern the meanings of our movement and to see how these meanings bear upon contemporary issues and problems, especially in matters of religious liberty and in church-state relations. In advancing this responsibility the organization carries forward studies and research projects, keeps abreast of developments by means of an information service, gives expression to public interpretations that make the movement understood, and facilitates conferences and discussions for the correlation of information and interpretations.

It is my privilege to serve as Executive Director for the work of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs. My background is

that of a school man rather than of a clergyman. After more than two decades of teaching and administration, I came to Washington nearly thirteen years ago to serve in my present responsibility. Accordingly, I have long lived with the issues raised by the current proposal for a constitutional amendment.

Throughout its long history the Baptist movement has stresed that in Christ God calls men to response and to responsibility under God. To proclaim this call we have developed large and well known programs of evangelism, or missions, of Christian education, and of Christian service. These efforts to relate men to God have always recognized that this cannot be achieved by law, or by conformity to government programs. Man's relationship to God lies beyond the competence of the powers of government.

In most historical situations in which our movement has arisen it has confronted some form of "established religion." In each instance the movement has carried a protest against the use of the powers of government for the imposition of religious ideas or religious practices. "Separation of church and state" has been a constant aspiration and goal. This goal has been a means to full religious freedom. We hold the conviction that the free exercise of religion makes for genuine responses and for full commitment, such as cannot be obtained by pressure of conformity. We have seen freedom of religion as a God-given or natural right of man, as the basis of vital religious experience, and as the beginning of civic freedom. So much of our history is directly relevant to the issues which are now before this Subcommittee that I am strongly tempted to cite data out of the past at great length. However, I am sure that you are more interested in what Baptists think now.

If the Supreme Court decisions of 1962 and 1963 had curtailed the free exercise of religion by the people, our churches would have protested this as a violation of the Constitution. However, since the decisions dealt with the role of government powers the Baptist channels that dealt with the issues saw them as contributing to the progress of a great principle.

Among us prayer is not a matter of social adjustment or of national heritage. It is understood to involve communication between a person or people and God. The presence or the absence of such communication is in no wise dependent upon the actions of federal, state, or local governments. On the contrary, attempts by public authorities to claim some permissive or regulatory power over prayer or worship cause apprehension among us.

It is the responsibility of our office to study and to report developments on the Washington scene. Accordingly, at the time of the Supreme Court's decisions we not only attempted an abjective view for ourselves but we encouraged our leaders generally to read the decisions for themselves. In each case, we distributed thousands of copies of the actual text, with urgent admonitions to study.

II. A DELIBERATIVE READING OF THE PROPOSAL

The full impact of national policy and practice that will result in the decades ahead if this amendment is approved cannot be clearly read at this point. However, enough can be read so that the proposal has aroused earnest concern and opposition in our constituency, as will be seen from resolutions and statements. In order that our reasoning be understood, it is necessary to make some of the implications stand out in clarity.

1. The phrase, "Nothing contained in this Constitution shall prohibit . . . ," clearly means that this amendment would operate to restrict the sweep of protection given to people vis-a-vis government by the First Amendment. Since the First Amendment is part of the American Bill of Rights guarding the people's personal freedoms against the undue exercise of governmental powers, the net impact of this formula is in the direction of a reduction in personal freedom and an extension of public powers. In the long run that change may be large or small, but the direction of change is clearly established by the formula.

2. The "authority" that is to be protected against certain limitations is described in a very broad description, ". . . the authority administering any school, school system, educational institution *or other public building* supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds . . ." (emphasis added). This language does not appear to deal with educational institutions solely, but would include the "authorities" that administer park buildings, post offices, public office buildings, court houses, etc. All of these "authorities" are to be protected against any prohibitions on certain specified actions that pertain to prayer. Since this formula encompasses a host of national, state, and local officialdom (by extension through the Fourteenth Amendment), we become vitally concerned as to the scope of those actions with reference to prayer in which they would be given overt constitutional protection.

A further important inquiry would involve the meaning of "in whole or in part." How large the public investment would have to be in order to protect the "authorities" in their actions is not clear. In fact, it could raise the church-state issue with reference to private institutions funded "in part."

In this context we must also inquire about the potential impacts of this proposal on the constitutional delegation of powers. Since some of the schools, institutions, and other public buildings are federally funded, either directly or by grants or loans, the language of this proposal can have far-reaching impacts on the federal system. There is no possibility of a clear legislative history which would adequately guard the potential uses of the amendment in future judicial findings. It would be a cruel irony if a move that was designed to guard the powers of certain "authorities" were indeed to erode those very powers by the expansion of federal powers in the longer course of history.

3. The language proposes to give constitutional protection to "authorities" to do two things with reference to prayer, namely, "providing for" and "permitting." In other words, it proposes to change a prohibition of action into an authorization for two kinds of actions, namely, making provision for, and giving permission. Both of these authorizations would unavoidably give public authorities roles which require actions and necessitate decisions and choices. At this point a caveat is in order on the broad scope of the two actions for which constitutional protection is proposed.

The term "providing for" is so broad as to be almost limitless in the scope of actions covered. It could mean simply assigning a room to a group for a meeting, but it could also mean building a chapel and naming and paying a leadership needed for the activity. It is difficult to envision the public actions which would be unconstitutional should future public leadership choose to use the broadest concepts possible under this vocabulary. The only exception in sight is the prohibition on the authority "to prescribe the form or content of any prayer."

The term "permitting" is similarly an almost unbounded term. Obviously the authorization to permit an activity would be empty verbalism if it did not include the authorization not to permit. This brings into focus one of the elements of genius in American religious liberty, because it is currently protected by a limitation on state power rather than by the public judgments exercised through a system of permits. Many governments "register" their religious groups through some administrative office operated by a "minister of cults." Those whose standards meet public approval get permits and the others face the necessity of certain conditions. A permit system, then, operates not only to afford opportunity for an activity but also to regulate it.

4. One may well ask whether the broad language reviewed above is not adequately limited by the fact that only "voluntary participation by students or others in prayer" is involved in the proposal.

Unfortunately this phraseology is equally broad. Any thoughtful use of the word "prayer" will include an awareness that it is always voluntary if it is genuine prayer and not verbalism. It lies beyond the competence of all "authorities" to compel people to really "pray." What, then, can be encompassed in the authoritative "providing for" or "permitting" "voluntary prayer"?

"Authorities" might be asked to provide the physical space; to arrange a time schedule; to require a personal presence in an area; to provide public notices regarding; to provide organization, leadership and supervision; to provide artifacts, equipment, and facilities; to provide needed symbols that call forth prayer; to arrange a friendly climate or a behavior norm; even to require the background of instruction needed in preparation for "voluntary prayer."

Some interesting questions regarding the nature of religious experience are raised by this vocabulary. For instance, what is "voluntary participation" for the three- and four-year-olds in the "Head Start" program? What is "voluntary participation" for the one Christian student in a population of Buddhists, or of one Buddhist in a population of Christians? What constitutes refraining from participation? Are not the organized norms of a teen-age code more binding than the "requirements" of officials?

The use of the phrase "participation in" is clearly indicative that the concept of prayer in the mind of the drafters is that of an organized exercise. To make this concept a part of the Constitution might well be challenged as an "element" of establishment. Who says that people cannot pray personally without the aid of a group pattern or exercise? However, if one is convinced that a group exercise is essential to prayer, then that exercise belongs in the home and in the church, under leadership selected for that purpose. It would be, obviously, misplaced in the hands of the "authorities" selected to "administer" public buildings.

5. A final word needs to be added with reference to the identification of the responsible "authority" by the participle "administering." Who "administers" a local school building, the supervisor of buildings and grounds? The principal? the superintendent? Or the Board of Education? The answer to that question may not be of significance to the drafters of a constitutional amendment, but the answer can be an important source of difficulty in a pluralistic religious community. The problems of the educators are vast and difficult in these decades of rapid change, increasing mobility, rising personal rights, and direct assertiveness by all minorities. This is an ill chosen time to burden public school leaders and other public persons with "providing for" or "permitting" the diversity of ideas as to what prayer is, and how it should be utilized.

III. THE POSITIONS OF THE CONVENTIONS

In view of the language of the proposed amendment, the major portions of several recent Baptist convention resolutions become relevant to this proposal. It should be noted that there is a strong affirmation of the First Amendment in its present form without other constitutional amendments.

In May, 1964, the Southern Baptist Convention, in annual session in Atlantic City, New Jersey, adopted this resolution:

"In this anniversary year we are grateful for the witness which our Baptist movement has been privileged to bear. The discernment of the call of God in Christ has led us to a glorious experience of evangelism and missionary outreach through the power of the Holy Spirit.

"Our leaders and our people have firmly rejected the use of the coercive powers of government in the realm of religion. Baptists had much to do with writing the First Amendment into the Constitution of the United States and have been in the forefront in preserving the religious liberty that our nation has enjoyed. We have unflinchingly declared our desire for separation of church and state in resolutions, in sermons and in policies and practices.

"1. We, the messengers of the Convention hereby affirm our support for the concepts and the vocabulary of the First Amendment, including both its prohibition upon government roles in religious programs and its protection of free exercise of religion for the people.

"2. We enunciate our concern that public officials and public servants of all types shall have the same free exercise of religion as other citizens, but that this freedom does not entitle them to use public or official powers for the advancement of religious commitments or ideas. In applying this principle to the field of public education we affirm the historic right of our schools to full academic freedom for the pursuit of all knowledge, religious or otherwise.

"3. We appeal to the Congress of the United States to allow the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States to stand as our guarantee of religious liberty, and we oppose the adoption of any further amendment to that Constitution respecting establishment of religion or free exercise thereof.

"4. We urge all our channels, leaders, and churches to involve themselves thoroughly in study of the biblical, the historical, and the contemporary issues related to religious liberty to the end that our heritage of freedom and responsibility under God may be clearly understood and appreciated by the next generation and by ever larger proportions of the world's peoples."

The earlier action was confirmed by a resolution adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention in annual session in Detroit, Michigan, in May, 1966:

"In the historic Baptist concern for religious liberty the separation of the state from the church has been and continues to be an important policy.

"In view of the renewed efforts to change the effect of the First Amendment this Convention reaffirms the resolution adopted in 1964 with reference to the adequacy of the First Amendment as the legal basis for implementing our concern. We continue to oppose any and all attempts to modify this guarantee against establishments of religion and against interference with the free exercise of religion.

"The importance of the policy of separation of church and state is increased rather than diminished by the overlappings of public concerns with church concerns, and by the numerous complexities associated with public provisions for health, welfare, and education.

"In view of the increasing complexity of public programs of fiscal support we commend the state conventions and the institutional trustees that have undertaken careful analyses of institutional policies with a view to the safeguarding of our historic concern for these principles. We likewise commend the Education Commission for launching a broadly representative study of contemporary denominational programs and needs in higher education.

"We urge all who plan or operate religious activities to refrain from seeking public funds for the advancement of sectarian causes. We also urge all public agencies that support educational, health, or welfare activities of any kind to safeguard against the use of public funds for the support of, or the advancement of sectarian causes, purposes or projects."

The American Baptist Convention, in annual session in Atlantic City, New Jersey, in May, 1964, adopted this resolution:

"Baptists believe that religious faith must involve a vital encounter between man and God and that religious form cannot be substituted for this encounter.

"The viewpoints of Baptists (in particular, John Leland of Virginia) with regard to religious liberty and the necessity for the separation of church and state had its influence on the writers of the Bill of Rights and resulted in the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States which has become the cornerstone of religious liberty.

"Thus Baptists have long opposed any compulsion to conformity in religious belief or in the practice of religion. The first amendment has supported this freedom. The proposed change in that amendment could weaken it and bring the power of the state to bear on individuals to conform and to participate in prescribed religious practices.

"An amendment to permit compulsory Bible reading and prayer in the public schools is not only a danger to the freedom of non-believers, it is also a threat to the religious well-being of the believer. It is because of a deep respect for worship, and the recognition that prayer is essential and should be a vital encounter between man and God, that Baptists oppose devotional exercises that are more rote than worship. Therefore we affirm our belief in the separation of church and state as written in the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

"And we reaffirm our historic Baptist belief that religion should not be a matter of compulsion and that prayers and religious practices should not be prescribed by law or by a teacher or public school official; . . ."

The American Baptist Convention reaffirmed this action in its annual session in Kansas City, Missouri, in May, 1966:

"We are aware that religious liberty is in jeopardy in many places around the world. We reaffirm our resolutions regarding Religous Freedom adopted by the American Baptist Convention in 1960, 1964, and 1965."

The North American Baptist General Conference meets in general session every three years. At its latest conference, in Sacramento, California, in July, 1964, it adopted this resolution:

"Whereas, Baptists have always taught that a genuine religious experience is a voluntary response to God, and

"Whereas, All persons have a right to the free exercise of religion, and

"Whereas, Governmental pressure to conformity in religious belief or in the practice of religion denies to people the freedom of religion, and

"Whereas, Baptists were influential in writing the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and have been in the forefront in preserving the religious liberty that Americans have enjoyed, and

"Whereas, the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that governmentally written and required prayers as well as required devotions violate the First Amendment: Therefore be it

"*Resolved:* That the delegates of the North American Baptist General Conference in triennial session—

"1. Reaffirm the resolution on religious liberty approved by the 33rd General Conference. (Pages 43–46 1961 NAB Conference Minutes.)

"2. That we reaffirm our support for the First Amendment and its present wording, including both its prohibition upon government roles in religious programs and its protection of the free exercise of religion. In taking this position, we wish to emphasize the right of public officials and of school pupils to the free exercise of their religion in harmony with the basic principles of religious liberty. We also affirm that this does not give public officials the right to use the authority of their office for the advancement or promotion of their religious views.

"3. That we urge all our denominational channels, leaders, and churches to involve themselves in the study of the biblical, historical, and the contemporary issues related to religious liberty, to the end that our heritage of freedom and responsibility under God may be clearly understood and appreciated by the next generation and by ever larger proportions of the world's peoples."

The following statement was adopted by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs in March, 1964, and reaffirmed in March 1966:

"The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs has taken note of a trend in many parts of our land to assume that the prayer and devotional experiences of children are and should be subject to legislation by boards of education. Accordingly, many are urging that the Constitution of the United States should be amended so as to permit such regulations by boards of education or by state legislatures.

"1. The Baptist Joint Committee reaffirms its conviction that laws and regulations prescribing prayers or devotional exercises do not contribute to a free exercise of religion and should not be encouraged.

"2. The Baptist Joint Committee also expresses a deep concern lest such laws and regulations become the means for confusing the moral values of American society for a devotion to religious insights. While the Committee is enthusiastic about much in the American heritage as a national way of life, the equation of religious ideas and practices with our national culture will erode rather than strengthen the American heritage.

"3. The holds that it is the business of the public schools, operated under law, supported by taxation, and attended by pupils under compulsory school attendance laws, to transmit the cultural legacy of our land. This requires the objective recognition of religion as part of the experiences of the people and as one force operating in our society. These premises, however, do not constitute religion and should not be advanced as the ultimate commitments for which people exist.

"4. The Committee recognizes that some political leaders may make appeals for the establishment of religious acts through legalized means to arouse public sentiment. This we regard to be in bad taste as a violation of the principle of separation of church and state. This is the basic principle of the Constitution of the United States that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . .'

"5. Conversely, the Committee appeals to Baptists everywhere to inform themselves carefully regarding the fundamental principles of freedom and to participate as informed citizens in the creation of a social order in which people of all religions or of no religion have the equitable civic treatment which they merit as people. Legislative representatives and political leaders should be made aware of our Baptist support for a clear distinction between roles of the churches and those of state agencies."

IV. A SUMMARY OF CONSIDERATIONS

Two years ago the basic ideas of this proposal were projected as a suggestion in the House of Representatives. That projection produced an extensive hearing by the House Judiciary Committee, and it produced among Baptists the best educational experience of this century for refurbishing the movement's involvement in behalf of religious liberty. The occasion was used to encourage a thorough discussion by the leaders of the several conventions, state conventions, associations, local pulpits and classes, editors, and educators. The result was a remarkable experience of concerted concern in spite of divergent local political backgrounds. The best description of that experience can be seen by reading the materials gathered by our office for the hearing record (Vol. III, pp. 2227–2308).

At that time I suggested that if any changes were needed in the Bill of Rights it ought to have a protracted discussion for not less than a decade. One-fifth of that decade has now passed and already certain key considerations are coming into focus among Baptists. Let me conclude this statement by identifying some of them.

1. The idea of limited government is a good and an important idea that must be kept alive in the public mind. If there are to be limits on government these must begin at the highest levels of value, namely, in the field of religion. As long as government is excluded from the field of religion we have limitations on the scope of government. If this exclusion is eroded and government is admitted to a role in the area of religion, government normally also permeates all the lesser values to which human beings commit their lives.

2. The First Amendment, with its dual emphases, against "establishment" and for "free exercise," is a uniquely effective formulation of the rights necessary for the protection of religious liberty. The rights belong to people, and the restrictions apply to authorities. These emphases have been interpreted by the courts to give the American people a large and an effective freedom. There is no need to tamper with the impact of the First Amendment. (See documentation in attached article by Dr. Walfred H. Peterson, Director of Research for Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs.) The permissiveness of the First Amendment is a permissiveness which leaves room for other interests beyond the state's scope. In short, the "free exercise" clause is adequate permissiveness.

3. The explanations offered in support of the current proposal indicate that there is no intention to overturn any judicial decisions but only to relieve fears and remove confusion. If these are the purposes, then in the light of the foregoing review of the language used, this proposal is an ineffective attempt. The way to relieve confusion and fear is for public leaders to exercise responsible communications regarding the scope and the impact of the judicial decisions that have effectively applied the concepts of a limited state at the state and local level as well as at the federal level. Such limitations are not empty legalisms, but rather than set guidelines within which creative programming can take place toward all the goals that are properly those of the state.

4. If a serious debate is desired about the merits and the demerits of the activities by authorities, as envisioned in this proposal, a careful comparative study should be undertaken. Many of the states in the U.S. have gotten along without such assistance by authorities for several decades past. Are those populations less religious than they are in areas where official involvements have continued through the years? Many of the European nations have had much official support for religious activities, but those nations are not now known for having deeply devout populations. Is there a positive or a negative correlation between the use of public authority for religious programming and the personal involvement in religious experience, including prayer? A number of careful observers believe the relationship to be inverse.

5. Religious pluralism, without the involvement of state powers in religious activities, has proved itself as a successful pattern by means of which to let public and political issues be isolated as such, and for keeping them free from religious divisions and fronts. The future will produce more pluralism rather than less. To burden public authorities with decisions regarding provisions for minority and majority prayers, with artifacts and commodities ranging from L.S.D. or peyote to kneelers and crosses, is to unduly encumber the future of democracy. Obviously, no common denominator is either available or desirable. If the authorities do not meet all requests, they must make choices.

6. Lest the above statements be misleading it should be understood that a respect for the religious limits on state authorities does not exclude (a) a full academic freedom for the responsible handling of the several disciplines in the curriculum, including the religious and intangible materials; (b) the free access to contemporary and past cultures including their art, literature, music, et al., even though they may contain or reflect religious opinions; (c) a genuine concern for virtuous living reflecting the best social values of our society; and (d) a friendly respect for religious conviction, religious participation, and religious institutions.

It follows that a secular public program is not "anti-religious," "ungodly," nor "pagan." Neither does it follow that if public institutions offer a limited program they thereby impose a splitting of the personality of those involved. Society consists of many specialized institutions, each with appropriate contributions to the person and his well-being. This pluralism of institutions serves to enrich and to emancipate rather than to stifle or dwarf the person.

7. Finally, there is much to be said in favor of keeping the Constitution intact and refraining from gnawing it away with piecemeal amendments. This concern was well formulated in 1964 for then Congressman John V. Lindsay, now Mayor of the City of New York. I quote four important paragraphs from that memorandum by Dennis B. Farrar (House Judiciary Committee Hearings on School Prayers, Vol. III, pp. 2758–2774). These paragraphs are fully as relevant in 1966 as they were in 1964:

"The Nation will survive if the proposed school prayer amendments fail of enactment. They are designed to right no fundamental wrong, to correct no glaring abuse. The supposed evils which they profess to remove, if they be evils, are of relative insignificance in the broad sweep of our nation's history and in the immediate realities of our daily lives. Only where a decision of the Supreme Court significantly and adversely affects significant rights of a group of our citizens and is otherwise without redeeming virtue should Congress attempt to correct the Court's judgment by amending the Constitution to give more specific meaning to the general principles embodied therein. The Constitution should simply not be amended every time a decision of the Court offends the sensibilities of a particularly vocal segment of our population.

"Piecemeal revision of the Constitution under the present circumstances will prompt the proposal of other amendments of similar dubious merit every time the Court hands down a controversial decision. In this way, the character of the Constitution as a permanent and enduring statement of general principles will be destroyed. Furthermore, the proposed amendments may also overrule or undermine by implication, much of the legal precedent on which the School Prayer cases were based . . .

"The inherent difficulties of applying section 1 (of the Becker amendment) are compounded by its requirement of 'voluntary' participation. One need not be a psychologist to recognize that subtle forms of coercion may force a small child to join his classmates and teacher in the recitation of a prayer which violates his private beliefs. Moreover, it is not clear whether the privilege of 'voluntary' participation extends to teachers as well as students. It is inconceivable how an orderly and effective religious exercise could be conducted in the absence of a teacher, and yet it is the baldest form of coercion to force a teacher into leading a prayer which is anathema to his or her beliefs. A nonconforming teacher is placed in the dilemma of either participating in violation of her conscience or not participating and subjecting herself to economic as well as social coercion. . . .

"Amending the Constitution in a piecemeal fashion to deal with specific details and practices only results in the creation of new problems of interpretation. The more a constitution deals with specific practices, the more questions it raises about other practices not mentioned. The amendment process should be used to state general and fundamental principles rather than to sanction any particular practice or activity."

*NOTE.—"The Record Speaks for Itself, Supreme Court—Defender of Religious Freedom," by Walfred H. Peterson, Director of Research Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, Washington, D.C., issue May 1966, pp. 5, 6.

DESIGNATION OF EXPERIMENTAL BREEDER REACTOR NO. 1 AS A NATIONAL HISTORICAL LANDMARK

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, in 1949 the National Reactor Testing Station was established in southeastern Idaho to build, test, and operate nuclear reactors. Since then numerous achievements which stand as major milestones in developing the beneficial uses of atomic energy have been made at this Idaho facility.

Today NRTS, encompassing 894 square miles of land on the Snake River Plain, is one of the principal centers for advancing the peacetime uses of atomic energy with the world's largest and most varied collection of reactors. Between 1949 and July of this year a total of 42 reactors have been built at NRTS of which 19 are presently operational.

Contributions first made to the atomic energy field at NRTS include: producing the first usable quantities of electricity; proof-testing the feasibility of nuclear propulsion for both submarine—the prototype of the nuclear submarine *Nautilus* was placed in operation there—and surface ships; demonstrating the principle of breeding nuclear fuel; powering of a turbojet engine exclusively from nuclear heat; demonstrating the advantages of using organic substances as a reactor moderator, and coolant; operation of a high-flux reactor with a 20-percent rather than a 93-percent enriched uranium as fuel; the direct coupling of a reactor to a closed-cycle, gas driven

turbine-compressor set; and the first plant-scale conversion of highly radioactive liquid wastes to solid form for safer storage.

Almost countless contributions to advancement of reactor technology have been made by the station's two large test reactors, the internationally renowned Materials Testing Reactor and Engineering Test Reactor. Practically every reactor in existence owes some debt to the knowledge gained through test irradiations in the MTR.

Significant contributions are being made at NRTS in the field of reactor safety. The special power excursion reactor tests and the safety test engineering program comprise a major portion of the AEC's reactor safety program which is providing valuable information to industry regarding safe operating limits for reactors.

This Friday at NRTS ceremonies will be conducted designating experimental breeder reactor No. 1 as a national historical landmark. Such recognition is certainly merited. On December 20 and 21, 1951, the first production of useful amounts of electricity from nuclear heat occurred at EBR–1. History will show that this single event was of incalculable importance to the future of mankind. It was truly an epic making event leading the experiment 4 years later when another reactor successfully supplied all the electricity needed to meet the demand load of the city of Arco, Idaho.

When EBR–1 was decommissioned in 1964 it had not only produced the first usable electricity by nuclear power but it had demonstrated that a nuclear reactor designed to operate in the high-energy neutron range, is capable of breeding—creating more fuel than its operation consumes—and also of achieving economically competitive nuclear power. It had produced usable amounts of electricity while using plutonium as a major fuel component and demonstrated the feasibility of using liquid metal at high temperatures as a reactor coolant.

Giving EBR–1 a special designation testifying to its national importance is therefore fitting as a tribute and reaffirmation of American genius. Idahoans are justly proud of NRTS, of what has been accomplished there, of the promise for future achievement which the past has created. I wish to join in heralding this significant dedication this Friday which will render deserved recognition not only to the historical value of EBR–1 but to the extraordinary value, past and potential, of Idaho's NRTS.

ADOPTION OF VIETNAM UNIT BY HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Alabamians are deeply concerned about the events in Vietnam. They support our fighting men 100 percent.

All across the State, cities and towns, colleges and universities, are supporting our men in Vietnam. They have conducted blood drives to minister to the medical needs of our fighting men there. They have adopted military units.

The latest city to adopt a unit is my hometown of Huntsville. I wanted to take this opportunity to let the Senate and the people of the Nation know that the people of Huntsville and of the Alabama are intensely patriotic. Although the job in Vietnam is a distasteful one, Alabamians support it because they know it is a necessary one.

Alabamians recall all too well the many lessons of history in which yielding to aggression only paved the way for more aggression.

When Hitler get his way at Munich, the world thought all he wanted was Czechoslovakia.

And before we could repair the situation thereby created, over 8 million people were dead around the world. If history proves anything, it proves that all a totalitarian government ever wants is just a little more.

I have made many speeches and statements about Vietnam. I have never varied in my viewpoint of what we have at stake there and what we need to do there to keep the country from falling to the unvarnished aggression that the Communists are demonstrating there. I support the position that America has taken in Vietnam.

It is sometimes said that American defense is not at issue in Vietnam. I believe that when we stop aggression in Vietnam, we defend America. The front lines of freedom stop where the front lines of communism begin.

The people of Alabama believe this and the people of Huntsville have demonstrated their belief in this by adopting the 93d Evacuation Hospital unit stationed at Long Binh, South Vietnam.

The "adoption" resulted from a letter received by Maj. Gen. Charles W. Eifler, commander of the 30,000-man 1st Logistical Command, of which the 93d is part, from the Huntsville Chamber of Commerce noting the city's interest in sponsoring an American unit in Vietnam.

General Eifler has termed the 93d Hospital team "most ideal for such a sponsorship because of its combat support mission and its dedicated service to the sick and wounded of the American forces." For this reason, he selected the hospital and recommended it to Rocket City where it met with immediate warm reception.

Today the 93d's 165 doctors, nurses, and officers, and more than 230 enlisted specialists including several Alabamians, provide skilled and modern medical care to our American soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division, 25th—Tropic Lightning—Division, and the 173d Airborne Brigade, as well as Australian and New Zealand forces.

The 93d has established an outstanding record since its first patients were admitted on December 1, 1965. It began as a few tents pitched in a sea of mud, surrounded by enemy snipers. Today the hospital is a large complex. It boasts 72 semipermanent buildings on its 35 acres of graded and improved land.

THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL SCHOOL AUTHORITIES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, at a recent meeting, the Houston Independent School District adopted a resolution concerning the relationship among Federal, State, and local school authorities.

The president of the Board of Education, Mr. Robert Y. Eckels, informs me the action was taken because of the feeling that local boards can better determine the needs within their area of jurisdiction and, therefore, funds advanced by the Federal Government can be applied more effectively.

I ask that the text of the resolution be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

During the last several years the Federal Government, through the Congress, has established many financial programs designed to assist local education. In the main, such programs have been for specific purposes with federal funds being made available for specific projects. Numerous federal agencies, in addition to the United States Office of Education, administer these funds. In many instances the specific purposes of the federal funds are limited in scope to the extent that local school boards find it difficult, if not impossible, to utilize these federal programs consistent with the overall general purpose of the legislation. Because these programs can be made beneficial to local school districts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Education of the Houston Independent School District, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to recodify the existing federal programs so as to create general purposes to be fulfilled rather than specific purposes, all of which funds would be administered through the State Education Agencies under the auspices of the United States Office of Education; be it further

Resolved, That such financial programs should meet general standards as established by the Congress, but left to local control, so as to promote efficiency and better overall results, and to give such programs the flexibility that can be accomplished only by local control; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the United States Senators from Texas, and to the Members of Congress from Texas.

Adopted and approved this 25th day of July 1966.

ROBERT Y. ECKELS,
President, Board of Education, Houston Independent School District.

Attest:

J. K. BUTLER,
Secretary, Board of Education, Houston Independent School District.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WORLD PRESS INSTITUTE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the World Press Institute, sponsored by Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn., and financed by 15 of America's major companies and foundations, is entering its sixth year of successful operation. This fine program is "based on the faith that the American way of life, freely exposed, is its own best advocate." As this statement indicates, the institute's purpose is to promote international understanding by unfolding the whole, complex American story, her history, present realities, and future aspirations, so that this story may be interpreted and reported accurately in the press of all nations.

To achieve this goal, the institute brings to the United States each August

a group of 15 young, promising, foreign journalists who spend the next 10 months studying, working and traveling in our country.

At Macalester College, they spend the fall semester taking courses in American history, government, and social institutions. Seminars are held with numerous outstanding figures in American life.

After the semester at Macalester College, the journalists take to the road to appreciate the full vastness of the American Republic. They visit major cities from San Francisco to New York; and at the same time they are learning about the local roots of American culture, Americans are also learning about them and the countries they represent.

The third phase of the World Press Institute program is a 3-month internship for each of the foreign journalists on a major American newspaper, radio, or television station. Among the newspapers and stations where the journalists worked this year, were the Christian Science Monitor, the Los Angeles Times, WRUL in New York, WHYY-TV in Philadelphia, the Baltimore News-American, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and the Washington Post.

The program is culminated when the fellows return to Macalester College for commencement and a World Press Institute forum and dinner, at which the Pulitzer Prize winners are special guests. This year's forum was highlighted by an address by Clifton Daniel, managing editor of the New York Times, who spoke about the Times' role in the Bay of Pigs invasion.

This program, which contributes so much to international understanding, is made possible through the generosity of 15 American corporations and foundations: American Motors Corp., Coca-Cola Export Corp., General Foods Fund, Inc., General Mills, Inc., Hammond Organ Corp., Hilton Hotels Corp., Johnson Foundation, National Cash Register Corp., Pan American World Airways, Procter & Gamble Fund, Radio Corp. of America, Reader's Digest Foundation, Signode Corp., Standard Oil of New Jersey, and Whitney Communications Corp.

During the past 5 years, many Minnesotans have come to know the World Press Institute fellows and to appreciate the value of this program. It is therefore with a great degree of pleasure that I congratulate the World Press Institute on its first 5 years of success, and express my sincerest best wishes that the program will continue to enrich the intellectual life of Minnesota and to contribute to the international understanding which is so essential for world peace.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF STARK BROS. NURSERY & ORCHARDS, LOUISIANA, MO.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the Senate's attention today the 150th anniversary of the world's largest and America's oldest nursery.

The Stark Bros. Nursery & Orchards in Louisiana, Mo., are today known around the world as the home of the Stark Delicious apple family—red and golden—which now supply more than half the fresh apples to world markets. They are also known for many new improved fruits, shade trees, roses, and flowers, including the beautiful Mrs. Luther Burbank Rose.

Over six generations, the life work of the Stark family has been dedicated to finer fruits, heavier bearing, better trees and plants, pretested new varieties, disease-resistant stock and improved growing methods. They have invested millions of dollars in research and today every variety of fruit tree that Stark Bros. grows is a record-bearing strain.

On October 15, in Louisiana, Mo., will be held the Stark-Burbank International Fruit Show. There will be a special ceremony during the show honoring Luther Burbank, who is known throughout the world for his fruit, flower, and ornamental creations. His fame grows with the years as Stark Bros. carries forth, at his request, the great work which he began.

We in Missouri are very proud of the outstanding contribution the Stark family has made to our State and National history. Capt. James Stark was an aide to Gen. George Washington. In 1812 James Hart Stark fought at the Battle of Tippecanoe. He later crossed the Mississippi River into what is today Missouri where he built his homestead and planted his orchard of grafted and budded fruit trees.

Some years ago, Lloyd Stark was a distinguished Governor of Missouri and chairman of the Good Roads Committee, which began Missouri's fine highway system. Many other members of the family have made notable contributions in our State. This history is now recorded for us by the Missouri Historical Society in a special spring, 1966, edition titled "The Stark Story." The lives of the Stark family have been intertwined with the lives of many famous Americans including Mark Twain, Thomas Edison, and the Speaker Champ Clark, the Missourian who was Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives for 20 years.

We are very proud of the family and its investment in our State and Nation. I know I speak for all Senators today when I offer the Senate's hearty congratulations to Stark Bros. on their 150th anniversary and best wishes for decades of service to come.

COMMUNIST CONCEPT OF MORALITY AND JUSTICE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently, the Ontario Telegram published an article written by Mr. Lubor J. Zink regarding the Communist concept of morality and justice, particularly with respect to the Kocevje massacre.

I believe Mr. Zink's comments are most noteworthy. I ask unanimous consent that his very interesting column be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENT

(By Lubor J. Zink)

OTTAWA.—When criminals set themselves up as lawmakers, the first thing they do is to fashion their own concept of morality and justice. Everything that serves their aims becomes moral and jurisprudence is turned into a tool of the perverted code of ethics.

All the modern totalitarian states have based their legal systems on the premise that might is right and that the desired end justifies whatever means are deemed necessary for its attainment. The ruling clique of the one-party state decrees what is right and woe to anyone who dares to question, let alone oppose the dictate. Even those who are considered to be merely standing in the way are branded as enemies and earmarked for liquidation.

COMMUNIST JUSTICE

In Hitler's Germany, the Jews and other "inferior races" had been slaughtered wholesale in the name of Nazi justice. In the Soviet Union, and later on throughout the satellite orbit and in Red China, countless millions of people were liquidated in the name of Communist justice.

After Hitler's defeat, his top-echelon henchmen were tried as war criminals by the outraged international community. To this day West German authorities are tracking down and putting on trial the lower-echelon accomplices in the ghastly crimes perpetrated by the bestial regime.

Although the total number of victims of Communist totalitarianism is estimated to exceed by far that of the Nazi tyranny, no one apparently dares to even consider demanding a trial of the Bolshevik criminals.

Stalin, the arch-murderer who pioneered genocide in this supposedly enlightened century, died peacefully in his bed, revered to the end by Communists all over the world as a messiah of social justice and progress. Khrushchev, who supervised Stalin's bloody purges in the Ukraine and later, even after revealing and denouncing Stalin's monstrous crimes, ordered the butchery of Hungarian patriots, enjoys the reputation of a jovial, good-natured old fellow. And there is nothing but praise all over the place for Yugoslavia's Josip Broz-Tito, the foxy player of both sides of the Cold War street.

People who now hail him as the great democrat among the Communist dictators, apparently do not know that this crafty old man has on his conscience one of the grisliest crimes of the immediate postwar days.

Few people know that at the end of May, 1945, when the guns were already silent all over Europe, Tito's partisans massacred close to 20,000 of their compatriots who, during the last stages of the war, tried to keep the Slovenian part of Yugoslavia free from Communist domination.

The motley remnants of what was once the Yugoslav Royal Army lost the battle and retreated into the British-held part of Southern Austria. There the Slovenian homeguardsmen, the Serbian volunteers and the Montenegrin Chetniks who remained loyal to King Petar were put in a camp near Klagenfurt and promised transfer to Italy where some other remnants of Petar's army found refuge.

MASS SLAUGHTER

However, on May 24, 1945, the disarmed Yugoslav troops were transported by the British to the Yugoslav border and handed over to Tito's partisans. The Communists took the transport to specially prepared clearings in the dense forests near the village of Kocevje and there, in cold blood, machinegunned the 20,000 men.

This crime of the Tito regime is described in detail by Yugoslav writer B. M. Karapandzic who now lives in Cleveland. His book, Kocevje, is based partly on extensive research and partly on an eye-witness account given by a survivor of the massacre who, wounded by the firing squads, managed to crawl from under the heap of bodies and make his way to Austria.

When I read the book, which accused the British of complicity in this horrible event and even gives the name of the British army major who was in charge of the transfer of the 20,000 men to the Titoists, I asked the British High Commissioner's office in Ottawa to check the gruesome story. After several weeks of waiting for the result of the query in London, I was told that the book's description of the Kocevje massacre was "essentially correct."

Further investigation is under way to clarify why the unfortunate refugees were sent back to Slovenia after they had been allegedly promised transfer to Italy.

The Tito regime, which never breathed a word about the Kocevje massacre and now tries to limit the distribution of Mr. Karapandzic's book as much as possible, will undoubtedly argue that Yugoslavs who opposed the Communist partisans were traitors. While some people may regard such an argument as debatable, no one can accept it as justification or excuse for the massacre of 20,000 human beings.

Shocking as the belated disclosure of the Kocevje horror is, it is, unfortunately, only a sample of the crimes committed by all the Communist regimes in the name of proletarian justice. How long can any decent free nation go on fooling its conscience and even praise and honor the criminals?

THE U.S. POSITION ON OKINAWA

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the U.S. position on Okinawa was outlined recently in a speech by Lt. Gen. Albert Watson II, the U.S. High Commissioner who directs its destiny.

General Watson's remarks are from a radio-TV address that he made to Okinawa's people marking his completion of 2 years as High Commissioner on August 1.

I know that my colleagues will be most interested in General Watson's views on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN POSITION ON OKINAWA

(By Albert Watson II)

I take a very real pleasure in greeting the people of the Ryukyus today since it marks for me the completion of two years of living on Okinawa. For this occasion I have prepared for you a review of those two years. The record is one of which all can be justly proud, for it is a reflection of the value of mutual cooperation and of constant endeavor. More than any other single factor, the progress which has been achieved is a tribute to your diligence and practicality and to your hard work to build a modern and progressive community.

Let us consider economic progress. There are many specific examples that are recognizable to you in your own experience in daily living.

In fiscal year 1964 the average per capita income of the Ryukyu Islands was $322 a year. Two years later, in FY 66 which ended just one month ago, the average per capita income was $424 annually, an increase of $102 or 32 percent in two years.

Another matter which means much to you is personal savings. Your net personal savings during fiscal year 1964 were 61.3 million dollars. During fiscal year 1966 your net personal savings were 105 million dollars. You, the people of the Ryukyu Islands, saved 43.7 million dollars or 71 percent more than you did two years ago.

In addition to saving more, you are buying more. For example, two years ago there were some 25,000 privately owned non-commercial motor vehicles excluding all American owned vehicles, in the Ryukyus. Today there are some 40,000 and this number increases by approximately 1,200 every month.

Another indication of economic growth is that the constantly expanding and improving telephone network cannot keep up with the demand for telephone service, both commercial and domestic. Building contractors are hard pressed to find materials and skilled labor to meet the ever-growing demand for private and commercial construction. New commercial facilities and expansion of existing facilities are announced every day. I am happy to have had a part in this rapid economic progress.

Cultural progress also is a cause of pride. There has been constant improvement in the educational system; new schools, school expansion, additional and more sophisticated school equipment and consistent effort to upgrade scholastic standards and increase economic benefits for teachers. The institutions of higher learning have received additional facilities and equipment. More and more young people have benefited from scholarships and from the student exchange and the Third Country Training programs. I am particularly pleased with the new commercial and vocational schools which opened their doors early this year. The modern technical facilities at these schools will provide your children with new techniques and trades, thus better equipping them to take their place in modern society.

In public health, we have been spared the horror of epidemic disease, the seasonal outbreaks of former years have been reduced or eliminated altogether.

The new Okinawa Central Hospital is one of the most modern medical institutions in the Far East. The U.S. Civil Administration has recently obtained the services of the University of Hawaii to establish a medical intern and resident training program at this hospital. American doctors are now working side by side with your doctors teaching them the latest techniques of modern medicine. Slowly, but steadily the shortage of trained medical personnel is being reduced.

The creation of the retirement annuity system for public service employees and the new medical insurance program are big steps forward in establishing a modern social security system.

My third topic, political progress is more difficult to examine and to illustrate than the others.

From the day of my arrival, I have actively supported the expansion of functions of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands in every appropriate way and have delegated to it increasing administrative authority. This has been in accordance with United States policy enumerated by the late President Kennedy and reemphasized since then by President Johnson. One of my earliest official actions was to reduce by one-third the number of ordinances and to eliminate parts of others.

Last week, at the request of the GRI, I amended CA Ordinance Number 10 to give local banking institutions greater flexibility in their lending authority. In addition I rescinded Ordinance Number 66 and by so doing transferred authority over the University of the Ryukyus to the GRI.

I am ready to rescind other ordinances when adequate local legislation is enacted to replace them. As an example, you will recall that I have announced my readiness to rescind the appropriate sections of Proclamations 12 and 13 to give your chief executive the authority to appoint all GRI judges as soon as your legislature enacts the necessary laws.

I have strongly supported the creation and successful implementation, in cooperation with the GRI, of an overall plan for the economic and social development of the Ryukyus, called the long range plan. This plan provides for optimum development of the economy and one of its key goals is the advancement of public health, educational, and welfare services to reach levels obtaining in comparable areas of Japan, to the extent possible, by the end of 1971.

The progress and future planning I have reviewed are part of the long range plan. The plan envisions that the per capita income will exceed $700 by 1971. I have done, and I continue to do, everything in my power to secure increased grants-in-aid from my government, and I welcome increased aid from the Government of Japan when it is useful and usable.

I enumerate these activities merely to demonstrate that I have worked steadily toward the goal of expanding the administrative authority and enhancing the prestige of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands.

I have said many times that I am very sympathetic to your earnest desires for reversion of Okinawa to Japan. I am not against reversion when the security situation permits. Unfortunately, in the reversion movement, the public has been led to believe that popular election of the chief executive is essential for autonomy, and that autonomy in turn, is believed to be the road to reversion. I urge you to realize that the road to reversion will be reached through Japanese-American cooperation. Popular election of the chief executive, while no doubt a desirable goal, is not related to reversion in any way.

Now I would like to set the record straight on another matter in which I recently made a decision.

I refer to the transfer of two cases from the Government of the Ryukyu Islands Court of Appeals to the Civil Court of the United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands.

The action was taken pursuant to the provisions of the Executive Order for the United States administration of the Ryukyus. It specifically states that civil jurisdiction over any case or controversy of particular importance affecting the interests of the United States, as determined by the high commissioner . . . instituted in a court of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands shall be transferred to the appropriate Civil Administration Court upon the order of the high commissioner at any time in the proceedings, including final appellate process, prior to the entering of final decree, order or judgment. Cases so transferred may be subject to trial de novo in the discretion of the court of the Civil Administration.

The determination that the cases are "of particular importance affecting the . . . interests of the United States" lies in the fact that they are concerned with the validity of ordinances. The Government of the Ryukyus interprets and enforces ordinances and other laws every day of the year. The two court cases under discussion were concerned with the GRI courts' challenge of the validity of two ordinances, and by implication of all ordinances and the basic right of United States Administration to govern.

Since the United States has the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of the Ryukyus under Article 3 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, the propriety and legality of any official act of the United States administration in the Ryukyus are properly subject to examination by U.S. authority only.

Such power has never been delegated to GRI Courts. In fact, the high commissioner is not permitted to delegate authority to examine the propriety or legality of any official act of USCAR.

Therefore, the GRI Courts by the transfer of the two cases have not lost any power or authority which they held before the transfer.

The action relates in no way to the efficiency, effectiveness, integrity, and ability of the GRI courts or judges, and does not reflect on them or criticize them.

Let's look at the record of increased authority of the GRI courts. In 1957 the USCAR courts handled 5,000 criminal cases. In 1964 the courts handled only 83. In 1965 the USCAR courts handled no criminal cases. So far this year they have handled no criminal cases. In the past two years, the USCAR courts have handled only three civil cases, all concerned directly with Americans. This record indicates complete trust in the Ryukyuan judicial system. It indicates complete trust and the constant delegation of authority. Yet these facts are never mentioned by those who seek to increase disorder and confusion out of the transfer and thereby try to interrupt the orderly processes of the Government of the Ryukyus.

No decision as to the merits of the two cases was made prior to the transfer.

I am aware that the transfer has been alleged by some people to constitute a slight to the opinions and welfare of the residents of the Ryukyus. I assure you that the U.S. civil administration has deep concern for the welfare of the inhabitants of these islands and your welfare is not being disregarded now. I would like to remind you in this connection that the primary purpose of the United States in the Ryukyus is to insure strong and effective bases for the preservation of free nations in the Far East. The United States necessarily must coordinate these two vital concerns and responsibilities, namely, the welfare of the people, and the effectiveness of the base. To permit U.S. ordinances to be nullified by GRI courts would be contrary to the system established by the executive order and would constitute a disregard for the latter responsibility.

I wish to reaffirm my intention to continue to delegate administrative authority to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands in every appropriate way. I offer my wholehearted cooperation in any practical plan to achieve this result.

In closing I would like to get a little sentimental, if I may. I have enjoyed these past two years in these beautiful islands as much an any in my career. This I attribute primarily to your courtesy and and kindness. I have visited many of your homes, your schools, your hospitals, your farms, and your industries. I have visited as many of your cities, towns, and villages as time has permitted. I am happy that I can call many of you by name and—believe me—in my heart I call all of you my friends. Yours is well named "shurei no kuni." I extend to all of you my sincerest best wishes for continued prosperity, good health, and long life.

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. ROGER STEVENS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, man's indifference and inhumanity to animals was a problem long left unnoticed. However, last week Congress finally recognized this deplorable situation and passed a bill governing the treatment of animals in interstate traffic.

The enactment of this law was due in large part to the hard work and diligence of Mrs. Roger Stevens. Mrs. Stevens has been a shining example of the private citizen who, with idealism and determination, can directly shape Federal legislation and substantially add meaning to our democratic political process.

We, as a nation, owe much to Mrs. Stevens as a champion of a just cause. Because of her, human decency, a fast-disappearing quality today, has become a requirement of law in animal treatment. Last week's congressional response and today's signing by the President is a fitting tribute to her efforts.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a recent editorial from the New York Times commenting on Mrs. Stevens' achievement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORY FOR ANIMALS

The cause of humane treatment of animals has achieved a merited victory in Congress. Both houses last week approved a bill that for the first time establishes strict regulations over the interstate traffic in animals used for medical research.

Investigation had revealed that many dealers in this profitable trade were keeping animals in pens too small for them to turn around in. Others often failed to provide necessary food, water, and opportunity for exercise. Under the leadership of Mrs. Roger Stevens, the Society for Animal Protective Legislation and allied organizations succeeded in arousing public and Congressional concern over this mistreatment.

The result is a bill that promises to be effective as well as comprehensive. It covers both the animal dealers and the laboratories that buy from them, although it does not enter the more controversial field of medical experimentation. The Department of Agriculture is empowered to draw up regulations covering not only dogs and cats but also monkeys, rabbits and guinea pigs. If President Johnson signs the bill, as expected, the statutory basis will be laid for a decisive and much-needed improvement in the care of these animals.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT INCENTIVE ACT OF 1966

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of S. 3598, entitled the "Pollution Abatement Incentive Act of 1966," of which I am a cosponsor. The unusual degree of broad sponsorship of this measure reflects accurately the extent of bipartisan support in taking effective steps to cleanse the environment in which we live.

Pollution of our atmosphere and waterways, which is simply the result of the ineffective waste management, is a national problem—affecting all facets of our society. Individuals, groups, and institutions both at the local and national level are affected vitally by this problem. All about us not only costly, but irreplaceable, assets are being destroyed or permanently impaired.

There is a widely recognized need for immediate corrective action by responsible groups at the Federal, State, and local levels. Of prime importance is the factor of carefully correlated planning, since many pollution conditions—both in the air and lakes and streams—are not localized, but affect broad regions. For many decades not enough has been done to alleviate the growing conditions of pollution which now give us such concern. At this point in time, we must concentrate on a catchup action.

Increased industrial activity combined with urban concentration have exceeded the natural capacity of air and water to assimilate wastes and effluents. Now we recognize waste management as an integral cost of business.

If air and water pollution are to be contained and gradually decreased, an integrated program involving government and key elements in the private sector must be delineated, documented, discussed, and dynamically implemented. Industry, business, civic groups, the news media, and the academic world must each identify and fulfill its role in this all-out endeavor.

While regulatory measures at State and local levels can go far to monitor and control the establishment of new industrial installations—including the construction of necessary pollution abatement equipment and man-machine procedures—a hard look also must be taken at existing installations. These facilities, daily creating uncontrolled waste of many types, are the nub of our problem. Industry's cooperation in modernizing its overall plant facilities to include waste recycling, controlled dispersal, and elimination devices is absolutely mandatory if pollution is to be reduced to an acceptable level. With each passing day, the situation worsens, so promptness in installing the corrective equipment is of vital importance.

S. 3598, which I cosponsor, provides an incentive tax credit for the taxpaper who undertakes a construction program for air and water pollution treatment facilities in cooperating with the Federal and State Governments on pollution programs. Thus, a positive move is being made wherein economic innovation can serve as a handmaiden to technical innovation in achieving satisfactory waste management.

It is important to underscore the point that this bill, dealing both with the construction of air and water pollution control facilities, affords tax benefits only to those taxpayers who obtain a certificate or statement from the appropriate State agency stating that said facility is in conformity with the State program or requirements for control of water or air pollution, as well as conforming to the Federal regulations governing such activity.

The Nation's business and industrial enterprises, then, are being called upon to sacrifice, in one sense—to expend profit moneys for the construction of pollution abatement facilities which are "nonproductive." This they are being asked to do in the interest of public health, welfare, recreation, and esthetics. We must remember that they still pay most of the cost of such improvements. S. 3598 hastens the installation of corrective devices and procedures through its incentive clauses. The concept is similar to the Federal grants to local governments to hasten the installation of sewage treatment plants and organization of air pollution control districts. The Federal dollar is a stimulus and an encouragement, but the local and private planning and control of funding is still the dominant factor, as it should be.

It should be noted that in some areas of these United States, industry voluntarily has self-imposed controls and standards, thereby achieving a high measure of pollution control while working with local authorities. In my own

state of Texas in the progressive, growing metropolis of Houston, the Bayport Industrial Park is recognized nationally as an outstanding example of modern industry establishing and enforcing high standards of waste management.

The drafting and promulgation of strict standards governing pollution control, firmly enforced, but without an accompanying economic incentive can cause relocation and measurable competitive disadvantages among industry. Also, the evolution of a noncooperative attitude on the part of industry could pose severe problems for government enforcement groups. Most assuredly, we do not want to engender a "catch us if you can" stance on the part of those firms affected by control regulations.

In addition to the incentive tax credit offered private firms for abatement construction, S. 3598 also permits the deduction or amortization of such expenditures over a period of from 1 to 5 years. This aspect of the present bill allows private enterprise a quicker recovery of its capital. This will benefit large and small industry alike; for the latter firms, with more modest resources, the requirement to install costly devices and time-consuming procedures poses difficulties, and this support in the area of nonproductive costs is especially vital.

Voluntary efforts to reduce or control pollution have been, for the most part, inadequate, but there are instances where industry has seized the initiative to the benefit of all. An event such as happened in Portland, Oreg., is worth recounting. There, a committee from the Associated Oregon Industries offered its professional expertise, at no cost, to the local government to draw up an effective air pollution code for the city. Local administrators were at first somewhat skeptical, but found that the code which resulted was fair and practical; in fact, the code has been termed by the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers "the best document on the subject to date." All of us are delighted with such voluntary actions, but by and large the enormity of the pollution problem dictates a strong government involvement.

The Congress, after prolonged study and debate, has undertaken to enact a series of laws designed to result in the prevention and abatement of air and water pollution. These measures offer substantial aid to State and local public institutions but do nothing for private industry and business. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Clean Air Act offer positive guidelines designed to lead to a better living environment. The virtually unanimous support of these measures is a true indicator that the leadership of this Nation has identified correctly a threat to our way of life and has moved forward to counter this specter with definitive and realistic corrective legislation.

Recognition of the developmental efforts being made has resulted in widespread official and public comment, and an increasing number of persons has come to realize that the effects of a polluted environment reach far beyond streams where swimming is banned or the irritation caused by smog. The hidden effects are subtle, often manifesting themselves in psychological as well as physiological ways. Our corrective measures must stress getting rid of gross pollution, and then we will be in a better position to tackle the subtle effects of this contemporary scourge. The need for action is now. As the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council report on "Waste Management and Control" declared:

> The problem is of the utmost urgency because many of the effects of pollution on our environment may be irreversible or, at least, may take generations to correct even if we start right now.

Public support for the extensive measures needed to restore the vitality and beauty of our land is reflected in correspondence to Government officials and at the polling place. Last November, in the State of my distinguished associate, and a cosponsor of S. 3598, Senator JAVITS, voters approved a $1 billion bond proposal for financing a cleanup of polluted waterways—and this was achieved by a 4-to-1 margin.

Indeed, a number of States have asserted through legislation their intent to combat pollution, including the offering of tax incentives to industry. Following the lead of the great Commonwealth of Virginia in 1950, tax relief measures were enacted by Wisconsin, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Ohio, North Carolina, South Carolina, Arkansas, Indiana, Idaho, Michigan, New York, and Connecticut. Even today several other States are considering legislation that will be useful in bringing pollution within bounds. These trends are encouraging, but more powerful resources must be allocated in this crucial struggle. I believe that a Federal incentive and regulatory system which is equitable and uniform must be established. Federal contributions, percentagewise, must be authorized to the maximum extent possible in order that locales and regions with lesser financial resources can participate in joint endeavors in waste management.

State and local governments have increased their pollution abatement expenditures by 47 percent from 1964 to 1965. They need to continue to add new tools and new knowledge to their arsenal in combating pollution. But industry must determine those steps which it must take to achieve optimum waste handling, and what in-house adjustments are necessary to initiate a facility modification program involving Federal-State-local funding. Part of this consideration is a determination of what election of tax writeoff affords the greatest relief in the fulfillment of requisite installation modernizations. S. 3598 provides sufficient flexibility so that business and industrial enterprises can select a set of options which will satisfy the unique conditions of the individual firm.

The cost of cleaning up our waterways and airways is very high, and the most careful planning is necessary if we as a nation are to win our battle against pollution. The effects of pollution control in one area must be weighed against the side effects in adjoining areas. Affluent modern man has created a quandary born of plenty. His ingenuity now must lead to ways and means of disposing of the residue of his material wealth.

It has been estimated that the negative effects of environmental pollution upon the American economy cost between $25 and $30 billion per year. The cost of counteracting this devastation to our natural resources, our communities, and our health—a cost to be borne by this and succeeding generations, is in the tens of billions of dollars. Even after we catch up and clean up, the cost will be high as we strive to hold the line. Waste management and control have to be viewed as a normal cost of modern society.

Our national program must be comprehensive, including basic and applied research in developing better pollution abatement and control devices; Federal technical assistance to State and local governments; increased funding for application to joint Federal-State-local projects; regulatory legislation at all levels to insure maintenance of healthful, viable living and working conditions; and tangible, substantial support to those establishments within our private enterprise system which not only produce the material items so essential to our contemporary standard of living, but which contribute so much in the way of employment and civic contributions to their communities.

The time for an all-out effort is now. I call upon my congressional colleagues and all elements within the Federal Government responsible for the successful execution of the fight against pollution to render full support for this bill. The vision demonstrated by the Congress in such forward-looking measures as S. 3598 will be instrumental in insuring the future of our Nation as the finest place upon the globe to live.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS CONFEREES APPROVE $104 MILLION FOR SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday a conference committee of the House and the Senate on the agriculture appropriations bill approved the appropriation of $104 million for the special milk program for schoolchildren for fiscal 1967. This amount was more than Congress appropriated for the program last year and exceeded the House-approved figure for fiscal 1967 by $1 million. However, I regret to say that it was $1 million under the Senate-approved figure.

All the evidence indicates, Mr. President, that $110 million is needed to adequately finance the school milk program in fiscal 1967. I have not simply pulled this figure out of a hat. It represents the amount that would have had to have been appropriated in fiscal 1966 if schools participating in the school milk program were to have been reimbursed by the Federal Government at the rates used in prior years. Of course, any program

growth in fiscal 1967 would make even the $110 million figure inadequate.

I intend to ask for additional funds for the school milk program in a supplemental appropriations bill. These funds are extremely important to the health and welfare of the Nation's children.

HAWAII HOSTS INTERNATIONAL SENIOR GIRL SCOUT CONFERENCE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, in its continuing quest for improved East-West relationships, Hawaii recently hosted an international Senior Girl Scout conference attended by 140 scouts from 11 nations and 43 States.

Seven representative delegates to the conference commented on their experiences in a published interview with Bobbie Conlan, a reporter for the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISLE GIRL SCOUT PARLEY LINKS FRIENDS, NATIONS

(By Bobbie Conlan)

Ideals reinforced and friendships cemented 140 Senior Girl Scouts will leave for their various homes tomorrow after two weeks of cross-cultural exchange.

Seven of them sat around a lounge in their dormitory at the East-West Center and attempted to explain what they have gained from their International Conference at which 11 countries and 43 states were represented.

"I expected friendship more than anything," said Australian Susan Kenny, 18, "and I think I've gained that."

"The thing that struck me, though," she continued, "was that on the very first day there was such a wonderful atmosphere of friendship."

"If you've ever been to a conference before, you know how it usually takes a while to create the right atmosphere. But here there was such a feeling of everyone wanting to know about you and your country . . . wanting to know not just you, but right down inside of you."

"It was as if we were all lifelong friends."

The seven girls—from Ceylon, the Philippines, West Virginia, Georgia, Australia, and Washington pulled their chairs into a circle, eager to further discussion.

Six of them were conferees. One, Susan Emanuels, 19, of Washington, was a Young Adult, one of 16 Scouts who, because of previous experience, helped plan the conference and acted as advisers for the other girls.

Susan Reilman (there were four Susans present), of Georgia, agreed with her Australian counterpart.

"We come from different countries and we have different customs, but we're all sisters," she said. "We can talk to each other like sisters."

The idea of the conference was to expose the girls to a culture different from their own to foster better understanding between East and West.

The girls were divided into units of eight. Several months before conference-time, each girl began to correspond with one girl in her unit—from the opposite culture—who then became her roommate at the East-West Center.

Cathy Hoskins, 17, from West Virginia, is rooming with a girl from the Republic of China.

"I've been giving her lessons in makeup and hairstyling and she's been teaching me very basic Mandarin Chinese," Cathy said, "like hello and good-bye."

Each girl said she had learned to appreciate another culture, another way of life, from the friends made at the conference.

Ramona Jayawardene, 18, of Ceylon, found American girls eager to learn and keenly interested in Eastern customs.

"They all want to wear saris," she smiled. "I knew there would be friendship, but I didn't think there'd be such deep friendship.

While discussions during the conference may have centered on large-scale ideas and ideals, the girls found these ideals put into practice in the little everyday things they did with each other.

They discovered that beneath the superficial differences, there were basic similarities.

Winifred Groves, a 16-going-on-17-year-old from Washington, found similarities in games; Susan Reilman, whose roommate was from Japan, found them in legends or fairy tales.

"The Peach Boy story is exactly like the Gingerbread Man story—but the two point up the differences between cultures," she said, going on to explain each fable.

"Boy, you sure know your fairy tales," teased Cathy. "I'd never remember the Gingerbread Man."

Then, more seriously, she added, "We do the same things; we just do them a different way."

The girls noted that people always talk about tolerance, truth, and sensitivity as ideals, implying a certain unattainability.

They, on the other hand, feel they have turned the idealism into realism.

"Other people have the hypothesis—we have the geometrical proof," was how Cathy put it.

"I've learned to be more tolerant," said Susan Kenny. "Australians are very willing to look at themselves, but not outside themselves.

"And we're very inclined to look toward America for culture.

"But I've come to realize that the distance between Australia and Ceylon and the Philippines . . . is not very great. We could take from them so much that they are so willing to give—in cultural things—instead of taking so much from the West."

Susan Anima, 18, of the Philippines, said, "Something I've learned from the American girls that I would like to see practiced in the Philippines is preparedness.

"I was amazed at how prepared the American girls were, how they do things right away. You are challenged to be prompt.

"In the Philippines I will admit we often do things at the last minute, leaving it till tomorrow."

Susan, in her turn, has taught many of the girls the graceful Philippine dance that she does so well.

"Not only have we learned other ways, we've also learned more about ourselves," said Susan Reilman.

"I'm coming away knowing so much more about the United States than I have ever known."

THE FUTURE OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a most interesting article by Gen. Ira C. Eaker was recently called to my attention. The article concerns the problems presently being experienced by NATO, and it appeared in a number of U.S. newspapers which carry General Eaker's column.

I believe it is worthy of the attention of my colleagues and all those who are concerned about the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which has played such a commendable role in guaranteeing Western freedom.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT EVER HAPPENED TO THE RUSSIAN MENACE?

(By Ira C. Eaker)

There is unmistakable evidence here and abroad that NATO, as an effective defensive alliance, is breaking up. The departure of French forces and the withdrawal of all NATO military forces from France, requires prompt and extraordinary effort from the remaining 14 partners if NATO is to continue as a credible deterrent to Russian aggression. Such efforts are not now discernible.

On the contrary, Britain is proposing to withdraw her troops from Germany. Several U.S. squadrons, forced to pull out of France are returning to the U.S. Senator MANSFIELD says that it is the sense of the Congress that our military strength in Europe be drastically reduced, initially by at least 75,000. The European partners show no disposition to increase their own financial and troop commitments to NATO, to replace the French defection.

The only rational explanation for the decline of NATO is the judgment that Russia no longer is a serious menace to Western Europe. An examination of the validity of this conclusion appears to be pertinent and timely.

Has Russia reduced her military forces along the NATO line? On the contrary Red forces in the Warsaw Pact area are stronger than at any time since NATO was formed. The Red ground forces are better trained and equipped. Antiaircraft defenses are much improved. Most ominous and significant is the great increase in Red missiles with nuclear warheads now deployed along the NATO line.

Has Red leadership indicated any change of policy or shown any evidence that it has altered its plan for world conquest? All proposals for disarmament made by the West have been spurned by Moscow. Every effort to induce Russia to intercede for peace in Vietnam has failed. On August 3rd Premier Kosygin, in a Kremlin speech, said, "The Soviet government will do everything in its power to help the Vietnamese people to drive the American invaders from Vietnamese soil at the earliest possible time."

Since there has been no reduction in Russian military forces aligned against NATO and no evidence of any change in the Red plan, what accounts for the strange relaxation in vigilance and concern, the unaccountable somnolence of the NATO partners?

The release August 7th of a thoughtful and factual study by the American Bar Association entitled, "Peace or Peaceful Coexistence," suggests a likely answer. It turns on the definition of peaceful coexistence. The present Soviet leaders, as did Khrushchev, the study points out, are committed to a policy of peaceful coexistence with the West. To the Western leaders this means Russia wants peace, not war. To the Kremlin this means that instead of military attack, involving the possibility of a nuclear exchange, other methods of conflict will be employed for a time, such as propaganda, subversion, sabotage, support for so-called "wars of national liberation"—anything to reduce the will and economic and military strength of the West and insure ultimate Communist victory.

When Khrushchev was peacefully coexisting, he was slipping missiles into Cuba and spending large sums to support revolutions in Africa and South America and for a vast spy apparatus in the West.

Kosygin and Brezhnev are now peacefully coexisting by sending technicians, missiles, oil, and munitions to Vietnam.

It is clearly evident that Red leaders are not, however, relying entirely upon peaceful coexistence for ultimate victory, since they are presently spending a greater percentage of Russia's gross national product upon arms, armed forces, and research for new weapons than at any time since 1950.

HIGH LEVEL MEETING AT FOOTBALL STADIUM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, Ruth Montgomery, in her August 16, 1966, article, calls our attention to a rather interesting meeting of the President and Edward Bennett Williams—Bobby Baker's lawyer—while attending a football game at the Washington Stadium.

Under the circumstances, there may be some question as to the discreetness of such a meeting.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "High Level Meeting at Football Stadium," printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH LEVEL MEETING AT FOOTBALL STADIUM

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—Now that details of Luci's wedding dress have become a footnote in history, the biggest remaining family secret is what President Johnson and attorney Edward Bennett Williams talked about at that recent Washington Redskin-Baltimore Colt football game.

Two aspects have contributed to the mystery: LBJ has never been considered a football fan, and it's the only time the President has attended any sports event without sharing his box with some congressional cronies and White House aides.

BAKER'S DEFENSE LAWYER

Observers noted that LBJ and Williams, president of the Redskins, were engaged in deep conversation throughout the first half of the exhibition game, until LBJ's prospective son-in-law finally joined them during the second half.

An ordinarily well-informed official says he knows what they talked about. "Where else," he asks, "could the President of the United States meet the defense counsel for Robert (Bobby) Baker, without giving away the fact that he was taking an active interest in Bobby Baker's defense?"

To drive home his point, he added: "If you re-read 'the Penkovskiy papers' you will see that this is normal procedure for an exchange of secrets. Spies consider that the safest place for such exchanges is at sporting events and the two-dollar betting windows at the track.

"If Bennett Williams came to the White House, or if LBJ went to his legal office, the world would immediately know they were discussing the Baker case. On the telephone, there's too much chance of eavesdropping. What better opportunity than an otherwise empty football box, and what better excuse than that Pat Nugent was holding his bachelor party there, in another part of the stadium?"

Two years ago, the Bobby Baker case was the hottest topic of conversation in Washington. The one-time impoverished page boy had become a millionaire during the years that he served on the Senate payroll as Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson's right-hand man. As secretary to the Democratic majority, he collected and dispensed large amounts of cash, including campaign funds.

Forced to resign after sensational charges were brought against him, he took the Fifth Amendment rather than answer the questions of a Senate committee. Later, the Democratic-controlled committee obligingly swept the investigation under the rug.

The Justice Department case against Baker could not be so lightly dismissed; but although it was expected to come to trial this summer or early fall, it has conveniently been postponed until after the November elections.

FORTAS HAD THE JOB

Abe Fortas, a close friend of President Johnson's was serving as Bobby Baker's defense attorney in a $300,000 vending-machine suite against him, but he resigned from the case before being named a Supreme Court justice.

Edward Bennett Williams, a noted criminal lawyer, is now handling the defense of LBJ's former protege; and one thing, at least, is certain. The President of the United States and the president of the Washington Redskins had a lot to say to each other, in a guarded stadium box, while the Colts trounced Williams' Redskins.

SEDUCTION BY STATISTICS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, many of the problems which beset our Nation and the world are the result of misunderstanding between people. And one of the causes of the misunderstanding is the way statistics are twisted by skillful manipulators to serve their ends, or to achieve the objectives they seek.

Recently our very distinguished minority leader took a look in depth at some of the figures he had seen and heard quoted many times, and he recorded his findings along with his views on the hocus-pocus that is taking place.

The article by Senator DIRKSEN entitled, "Seduction by Statistics," in the July issue of Nation's Business magazine exposes how some of the Washington wizards twist the figures to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people with what the Senator calls "hallucinatory estimates for masquerade and mirage in an extravaganza of political chicanery."

I commend the article to the attention of the Senate and the public. Mr. President, I ask leave that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEDUCTION BY STATISTICS

(By EVERETT M. DIRKSEN)

The city of Washington is the world center for the manufacture of statistics. Several thousand of the 2,542,590 employees on the United States government's $17 billion annual payroll spend their days feeding magnetic tape into computers and drawing off columns of figures. What kind of guidance do their statistics provide? Who is really benefiting from them?

Studies such as those dealing with the perspiration problem of Australian aborigines, or with the rate per hundredweight for trucking yak fat from Omaha to Chicago, are not at issue here.

My concern is with statistics essential to the formulation of sound national policy. And I charge that some of them reflect not facts but a mirage. Some are pure sleight of hand. Still others are hallucinatory. Indeed, figure management now reinforces news management in Administration tactics. The combination, as I intend to show, can be doubly dangerous.

The foremost example of sleight of hand statistics is, of course, the national budget. The President has raised it from just under $100 billion—a figure known to have been inaccurate when presented—to $112.7 billion. To you and me that looks like, and is, an increase of nearly $13 billion. But the image-makers in the Administration noticed that the President, as all Presidents must do, had trimmed some of the more pendulous fat off the amounts of money requested by various agencies and departments. So out came an inspired news release, headlined "President Lops $10 Billion from Budget."

Can a $13 billion budget increase really be a $10 billion cut? It cannot. It is an example of what George Orwell identified in his prophetic book, "1984," as "newspeak." It is like describing the world's biggest spender as "frugal," or Russia as a "democracy." Nobody really should be fooled by the federal budget.

Much the same sort of numerical flummery, as many citizens are discovering, goes for last year's loudly trumpeted tax cut. What was benevolently extended by one hand of government as an income and excise tax cut, was withdrawn by the other as a hike in social security taxes, a little later. The harsh fact is that today the tax collector at all levels of government, local, state and national, takes 35 per cent of the national income.

WHERE THE HOCUS-POCUS STARTS

Largest and most potent of government's hallucinatory statistics is the gross national product. The GNP—most widely accepted indicator of the pace of America's economic growth—is used by the government also for divination and to produce euphoria in the face of inflationary spending. It is a gross national illusion. One man toiling away in the Department of Commerce, "guesstimates" the GNP by counting the dollars spent for certain goods and services, every time they go by.

He may not wear a conical hat and a black robe decorated with cabalistic diagrams, but mystic and intuitive elements do seethe and bubble in his pot.

The synthetic figure produced is stupendous—$720 billion this year. With inflation now going at the rate of more than two per cent a year, the GNP rises automatically by $4 billion every quarter. To make it leap upward still faster, a skeptic suggests that every man be ordered to pay his wife $40 a week as cook and housekeeper. That would not produce any more wealth though it might set off some fireworks. But it would, as if by magic, push the GNP statistic on toward the $1 trillion figure.

At that level, incidentally, the GNP would about equal the real national debt, $947 billion, which is three times as high as official statistics report it. (The official debt figures omit about $600 billion owed for services already rendered, such as the $40 billion the government owes the civil service retirement fund.) The GNP is not wealth, nor earnings nor anything else you can touch, borrow or spend. It is only a statistic, but every day someone says we can afford still another vast expenditure because it would "require less than one per cent of the GNP." And all too often we do make the down payment on still another tremendous program, with tremendous and unknown costs to follow.

Ironically, last summer the U.S. Commerce Department itself renounced as erroneous the GNP figures it had produced since 1929. It recalculated the lot, and then came up with a higher figure for the annual increase in labor productivity.

The increase was small, from 3.6 to 3.7 per cent, but it was sufficient to provide labor union economists a basis for demanding that

another famous figure—the Administration's guidelines for wage increases—be adjusted upward.

THE STATISTICAL SNOW-JOB

A bureaucratic technique now being skillfully employed in Washington can be properly termed the statistic avalanche.

A distinguished practitioner of the avalanche is Sargent Shriver, a handsome and voluble man with energy enough to run (until recently) two high government jobs while dreaming of a third. The avalanche device is triggered, for example, when Mr. Shriver is questioned at press conferences about instances of what he defends as high-spirited mayhem or arson in his scandal-ridden, politically manipulated Job Corps, which is part of the federal poverty program.

On one occasion last fall, he called down a tumbling mass of statistics which rolled end over end, at express train speed, to engulf the reporters. It included data ranging from the annual cost of keeping an inmate in the Illinois penitentiary at Menard to the median consumption of fish, classified as to weight and species, by seals in the Seattle zoo.

When at last the rush subsided, the shaken questioner was sorry he had asked the little question that started it all, namely: "How much more does it cost to keep a boy in the Job Corps than in Harvard University?"

The question has been buried in the statistical snow-job. There it will remain forever unless a shift in the political glacier opens a crevasse and exposes it to view.

Plain deception meets the needs of some. Arthur Sylvester, assistant secretary of defense for public affairs, has made it clear that the Administration would not hesitate to deceive about defense affairs when it deemed deception necessary. Some of the news out of Viet Nam persuades many of us that he was, in that statement at any rate, telling the truth.

Those who class the war on poverty with Viet Nam in importance surely are engaging in deception. So are the postal snoopers and the Internal Revenue wiretappers, whose work seems more suited to a collectivist than to a great society.

A phantom statistic which even compels its compilers to smile is that showing "the rising productivity of government employees." There are, of course, many conscientious, hard-working government employees among the myriads, but they are all supported by the work of someone else. What could they produce, but statistics?

HAULING OUT THE BOGEYMAN

An old favorite is what might be called the Cheshire statistic. It is pulled out of the air like a magician producing a bowl of goldfish. Such a statistic was the basis for the charge during the 1960 Presidential campaign that "17 million Americans go to bed hungry every night." Not four million or 18.1 million, but 17 million exactly. Unless many of them were reducing, that seemed to indicate a deplorable breakdown in a public relief system which was even then the most gigantic ever conceived. But then President Johnson raised the figure two years ago to 35 million. It hung on the campaign air a while like its predecessor and then faded gently from view.

So did the terrifying missile gap discovered by Democratic creators for use in the same campaign. Both were meaningless as fact, but useful as bogies for whipping up emotion.

The dictionary defines that as demogoguery.

Cheshire or phantom statistics are common in foreign affairs, too. Successive Presidents have extolled military aid as assuring the United States of staunch allies, ready to spring to our side in the fight for freedom with "250 strategic bases, five million ground forces, 10,000 aircraft and 2,500 vessels." Well thousands of American men are fighting for freedom today in the dark jungles of Viet Nam, but where are those eager allies?

We know where some of them are. More than 200 different ships of a dozen free world nations which have received $29 billion in American aid are busily hauling munitions to our communist foe, the Viet Cong. Others which receive even greater sums are running supplies through our toothless "quarantine" to Communist Cuba, in defiance of all our pleas and entreaties.

If we cannot expect gratitude for the $130 billion we have poured out in postwar foreign aid, might we not demand decency? The scale of our generosity, by the way, is shown by the fact that interest on the public debt, ballooned by this aid, now runs more than $1 billion a month, or about twice the current cost of our struggle in Viet Nam.

THOSE STRETCHABLE YARDSTICKS

Rubber statistical yardsticks to fit varied occasions also are common in government. For gauging unemployment, the long yardstick is used. Housewives, youngsters, people resting unconcernedly between jobs, are all counted as jobless to bring the unemployment total up to a level intended to cause public worry. Although unemployment is given as 2.9 million, a former director of the census recently estimated the number of male family heads out of work at only 600,000. Nobody really knows. The official guess is extrapolated from a survey of only 35,000 families.

An effort to provide a count of job openings available was defeated last year in Congress by labor union pressure, as tending to minimize the pathetic plight of the honestly apathetic.

The myth of suffering millions searching in vain for work apparently must be preserved, even though employers from one end of the country to the other complain of their inability to hire help.

There's a saying now which goes: "If you don't like the heat, change the thermometer."

For many years, the Administration's economists, along with pundits and commentators, had bemoaned the existence of a "dollar gap" abroad. But more recently, as everyone knows by now, the recipients of American bounty abroad have drawn down our gold reserves by billions. They have been able to buy gold because our gifts, loans, investments and purchases abroad have been running about $3 billion a year greater than their transactions with us. So, suddenly with the mysterious unanimity of a cloud of gnats, they all changed direction. The dollar gap had become a dollar glut.

A cut in business investment and tourist purchases ordered by the Administration did not help enough. (Nobody knows what tourist purchases amount to.) The glut continues to grow. The Administration itself keeps on spending and donating dollars abroad through a dozen spigots. The money goes out as foreign aid, as bounties to foreign governments for sugar and coffee, as research grants to foreign scientists, as expenditures to keep U.S. troops in Europe to defend prosperous allies from whom we now are borrowing money, and in other ways. Further damage to our dwindling gold stocks seemed certain. What to do?

NOW YOU SEE IT—

The problem, as our leaders saw it, was how to make things look better without actually turning off or curtailing their spigots. Last August somebody came up with an idea. The government began computing the balance of payments in a new way. Dollars held by private institutions abroad were dropped from the liability column on the government's statistical tables, although they had been included in the earlier system of accounting because they can become official claims against our gold the moment they are turned into a central bank.

So, where the old fiscal thermometer showed a deficit of more than $3 billion for 1964, the new one cut it in half. The fever has not been changed, just the thermometer. We have a new statistical mirage, and the band plays on.

One of the most serious of all the government's statistical fantasies, however, reflects our balance of trade, which is a vital part of the total balance of international payments problem. For 20 years, Commerce Department officials have been pleased to inform the President, the Congress and the people that the United States regularly sells more goods to foreign lands than they sell to us. Our foreign trade was seen in wonderful health.

With the assurance of great and rising prosperity in foreign trade, Congress has gone along with successive Administrations, Republican as well as Democratic, in acts of generosity to our outdistanced trading partners abroad. We cut tariffs, increased foreign aid and borrowed $130 billion to lend or give away overseas.

At the same time we shipped—and are still shipping now—mountains of food and fiber as outright gifts or in exchange for nonspendable forints, dinars, zlotys, kips and rupees, all of which are reported by the Department of Commerce as commercial exports. This, of course, swells the export balance, but we receive no dollars. Americans who questioned our financial capacity to do whatever we liked, without limit, or who doubted the wisdom of supporting dictators who were busy sharpening the swords of our enemies, were laughed to scorn.

Not until the dollar stood shaken and defoliated, not until our gold stock had plummeted, did people begin to wonder if our balance of trade had really been as great as reported over the years. We began to ask if we had exposed ourselves to the gold drain by a statistical mirage in foreign trade earnings.

The answer, if you dig deep enough, is this. The United Kingdom and most other nations value imported goods on the "c.i.f." (cost, insurance, freight) basis. That means they take the purchase price abroad, add shipping and insurance costs, and end up with the total cost of the merchandise landed in their own country. The difference between the seller's figures and the buyer's is just freight and insurance. It is proper that those costs be added to the valuation of imports.

But here's the catch: The United States does not add freight and insurance costs in computing the volume of imports. We do not keep the same kind of books as our trading partners. We value our imports on the "f.o.b." basis, foreign port of shipment. Our valuations are simply the cost of the goods abroad, with freight and insurance disregarded.

From that difference in accounting arises the mirage. Our statistics are not comparable with those of other nations. We understate the value of our purchases from Great Britain, for example, by an average of 22 per cent. And that, in computing trade balances, produces a violent distortion of fact.

The distortion is even greater in trade with more distant countries, since freight and insurance cost more. Our "officially" certified favorable trade balance with Japan for the three years 1962–64 was $413 million. Change our imports from Japan to the realistic c.i.f. basis and that favorable balance becomes a $677 million deficit.

The cheerful statistics showing U.S. manufacturers fully competitive in foreign markets become the more badly battered the deeper you look. The supposed favorable balance in our world trade is actually a deficit.

THE MANUFACTURED STATISTIC

The foreign aid bill, hailed by the Administration as a bare-bones measure, in truth provides for an expenditure of about $6 billion in new funds, which is nearly twice the figure used in appropriations' requests. The bare-bones mirage is achieved by fragmenting the total cost and by financing big chunks of our foreign assistance—so-called food for peace, for example—under different labels, in fine print.

Now I am not a statistician, and I hold no brief for any particular accounting method. I favor expanded foreign trade. I have voted for AID. I admire our other trading partners. But I do most strenuously object that figure management, like news management, keeps us from reaching sound policy decisions on the basis of fact, not propaganda.

The statistical discrepancy between U.S. and foreign import trade accounting, for example, should have been volunteered to Congress and the public by our officials, and explained fully and frankly. This should have been done at the very beginning of the postwar period, when policy was being formed. It was essential knowledge then, and it is essential knowledge now.

Throughout the postwar period, Uncle Sam has acted in the belief he could adopt and carry out any program he considered desirable, whether at home or abroad, whether at the center of the earth or on the surface of the moon.

The balance of payments crisis and the costs of the grave struggle in Viet Nam remind us once more that nations, like families, must make choices. No nation can do everything it might like. When Washington implies that it can, it is a form of seduction of the public.

Moreover, we have learned from Mussolini, Hitler, Stalin, Peron and the other arrogant socialist dictators of our era that governments which manipulate facts are manipulating their people. A democracy can keep its freedom only as long as it is allowed to base its decisions on facts.

SOIL SURVEY SERVICE FOR URBAN AREAS—S. 902

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as one of the authors of legislation to permit the Department of Agriculture to make its soil survey service available to developing urban areas, I am delighted that the House of Representatives has passed S. 902, Senator ELLENDER'S bill to accomplish this purpose.

I am also pleased that the House of Representatives has added a section to the bill protecting the rights and interests of private firms engaged in this work. It is an excellent amendment and one that should not be an obstacle to the House-Senate conferees on the bill.

I hope that the conferees reach an early agreement on the bill and that it can be adopted, as amended, by the two Houses with dispatch.

Traditionally, soil surveys have been used to identify prime farmland and to select areas suitable for different kinds of crops, grasses, and trees and for guiding optimum systems of soil and water management practices. The same basic principles of soil behavior are now used extensively to determine the use of a soil for houses, highways, industrial sites, and recreational facilities. Soil surveys include maps of the kinds of soil, which are interpreted according to such qualities as soil wetness, overflow hazards, depth to rock, hardpans, permeability, erodibility, shrink-swell potential, and hazard of slippage on slopes. Soil surveys provide information that can be used to predict the results of using specific kinds of soil in different ways.

The most dramatic example of construction on unsuitable sites is in California, where earthslides carry houses away with them every rainy season.

But we have had our mud slides in New Jersey. In South River, N.J., 4 years ago, vegetation was stripped off 45 acres by a housing developer and heavy rains brought flooding and mud slides which caused damage estimated at $100,000. In many places in New Jersey septic systems have been installed in clay or rocky soil. They bubble up to the surface, causing a severe health problem and, in many cases, severe financial loss to the homeowner.

Cracked foundations, shifted chimneys, wet cellars, all these and many other problems are caused by construction on the wrong site.

All that is asked in this legislation is a change in policy by the Department of Agriculture. No appreciable additional appropriation is required. And, put to proper use by planning boards and commissions, zoning boards, water districts, other governmental agencies and by developers and builders, this legislation can save many millions of dollars.

GLOOMY GAMBLERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Peter R. Kann, entitled "Gloomy Gamblers," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on August 24, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLOOMY GAMBLERS: CHARGES OF TAX FRAUD, MOBSTER TIES LEVELED AT CASINOS IN NEVADA—STATE, UNDER FIRE FOR LAX CONTROL, CONDUCTS PROBE—U.S. LOOKS AT SKIMMING—LOADED DICE AND MARKED CARDS

(By Peter R. Kann)

LAS VEGAS, NEV.—Nevada's multimillion-dollar gambling industry is in deep trouble.

Owners of some of the largest, poshest and richest resort hotel-casinos on the gaudy Las Vegas Strip have been called to testify before a closed-door State Gaming Commission probe of allegations that they are failing to report, for tax and other purposes, millions of dollars from casino revenues—a practice commonly called "skimming." It's claimed that this skimmed money is flowing into the coffers of notorious Eastern Mafia mobsters. The current state hearings could conceivably result in gaming license revocation or other punitive action against some of Vegas' gambling kingpins.

Las Vegas gambling also is known to have drawn the attention of a Federal grand jury in New York. For the past several months, it has been probing the activities of persons suspected of secreting funds abroad to evade Federal taxes. It's suspected that illegal money—and skimmed casino revenue would fall in this category—often slips into numbered bank accounts overseas.

LOADED DICE

Moreover, some major casino figures here already have been advised by the Internal Revenue Service that they may face criminal prosecution for alleged substantial understatement of casino income on Federal tax returns. Also, FBI agents recently reported that in a Tulsa, Okla., raid they uncovered large quantities of loaded dice and marked cards, some bearing the imprint of several major Nevada casinos. No charges have been filed, but the mere public mention of crooked gaming unnerves gambling executives here.

Less spectacular, but to many casino owners equally threatening, are other thunderclouds on the industry's horizon. These include the growing prospect of a tax hike on gaming by citizens petition or state legislative action and the rise of statewide anti-gambling politics and politicians.

Casino owners, however, aren't the only ones on the spot here. The skimming issue also poses a crisis for the gambling-and-tourism-dependent state of Nevada (gaming tax receipts in the fiscal year ended June 30 accounted for a third of total state tax revenue). Also under fire: Nevada's criticized gaming control system. It's also becoming a thorny problem for Nevada's Democratic Gov. Grant Sawyer, currently seeking an unprecedented third term in a tight campaign in which gambling and gambling control are emerging as issues.

One possible result of the current state hearings is an overhaul of Nevada's gaming control apparatus. "Further and more stringent financial controls may have to be legislated in the near future," said Gaming Commission chief Milton Keefer at the end of the first full day of testimony. The Gaming Commission, a quasi-judicial body, is one of the two arms of the state's setup for supervising gambling; the other arm is the Gaming Control Board, concerned mainly with investigations.

NEVADA VERSUS UNITED STATES?

Also partially on the defensive here is the Federal Government. Starting with ROBERT F. KENNEDY'S tenure as Attorney General, Federal agents have conducted an intensive investigation of suspected skimming and mob activity in Las Vegas. Several FBI agents currently are embroiled in legal action brought by Las Vegas casino owners alleging "bugging" of their offices in violation of state law. The state of Nevada—faced recently with FBI courtroom admission of bugging—has pledged to file a similar suit, thus perhaps yielding a direct state-Federal confrontation involving the legal issue of whether or not states can prosecute Federal officials for action taken in the line of duty. There's a further Federal quandary: FBI bugging may well prejudice any possible future Federal legal action against casinos here.

It's true that allegations of skimming and crime syndicate activity are nothing new in Nevada. But the current uproar is being taken far more seriously than earlier charges of questionable practices in the gambling industry.

It was touched off by the testimony of Vegas-based FBI agents in a Denver courtroom in late June during a hearing on an appeal motion on the extortion conviction of Ruby Kolod, a man who is a part-owner of the Desert Inn hotel-casino here. The FBI agents said in court that from March 1962 to August 1963 they had monitored a concealed microphone placed in the executive offices of the Desert Inn.

"HIDDEN" OWNERSHIP CHARGED

"We had information coming to our attention that there was a vast sum of money being taken off the top by the ownership of the Desert Inn," one agent said in court. Unlicensed or "hidden" ownership was also implied. Mentioned in connection with distribution of casino revenues were such prominent mobsters as Meyer Lansky, Sam Giancana and John Scalish.

This testimony was followed by a spate of stories in several major metropolitan newspapers specifically charging that up to $1

million a month was being skimmed at six Las Vegas casinos, including the Desert Inn, and being siphoned to the underworld leaders named by the FBI agents and to other crime chieftains owning "hidden interests."

Faced with the glaring press headlines, Gov. Sawyer on July 15 ordered the launching of the state probe currently taking testimony in secret here. During the first three days of hearings, owners of the Desert Inn and three other casinos denied skimming, state officials say. The hearings are scheduled to continue for several weeks, with other casino owners slated to take the stand.

The state, which has never taken any action against casinos for skimming, has wide powers to do so if evidence materializes. Under Nevada's gaming control law, all persons with ownership in gaming operations must be licensed and a license is considered a "revokable privilege." The State Gaming Commission has "full and absolute" authority to suspend or revoke licenses "for any cause deemed reasonable" by it. The Gaming Commission doesn't operate under courtroom procedure; the burden of proof may be placed on a suspected violator and guilt need not be proven in standard legal sense. Thus, while any Federal action on skimming could be tied up in the courts for years, the state could take immediate action if, to use Gov. Sawyer's term, "persuasive evidence exists."

Asserting the FBI testimony in the Kolod case "clearly implied" that the Justice Department possessed "specific data in relation to skimming operations at the Desert Inn," Gov. Sawyer on July 8 wrote to U.S. Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach requesting that such "evidence" be turned over to the state. More recently three top Nevada gaming officials traveled to Washington to see the Attorney General and top aides. So far, however, there is no evidence that the Federal Government will cooperate with the state investigation.

This apparent reluctance is attributed to several possible factors. For one, some Federal officials obviously lack confidence in state gaming control. They claim they have secretly passed information to the state in the past that hasn't been acted upon (state gaming officials deny this). Also, the Federal agents say they might risk key undercover agents or informants and secret investigative techniques by giving the state skimming data. Finally, Federal officials face the dilemma that in revealing information obtained by bugging, they might strengthen private or state legal cases against the FBI agents or help to hamstring any further Federal legal action. (Evidence obtained from listening devices, when installed by unauthorized intrusion, has been ruled inadmissible in Federal courts, though it's not a violation of Federal law; wiretapping, which involves physically attaching a circuit to a phone line, is technically illegal for Federal agents.)

THE QUESTION OF SUBPOENAS

The State Gaming Commission so far hasn't subpoenaed any FBI agents or other Federal officials in its skimming probe (IRS officials already have announced they won't testify if called), though that possibility hasn't been ruled out. "If they (Federal officials) have information they should give it to us; if there's a hint of cancer here we should have the means to remove it," says a top state gaming official, who adds, "Maybe they don't have any information at all." State officials are quick to point out that despite hints of evidence, no legal action on skimming has been taken by the Federal Government, either by the Justice Department for interstate transportation of stolen money or by the IRS for tax evasion.

However, Edward Levinson and other members of the former ownership group at the Fremont hotel-casino in downtown Las Vegas have been advised by the IRS that they may face criminal action for alleged substantial under-statement of casino income in the period April 1, 1961, through March 31, 1964. Their more recent tax returns also are being investigated. This information came to light in the proxy statement issued for the annual meeting of Los Angeles-based Parvin-Dohrmann Co., which purchased the Fremont for about $11 million on June 30. It's "extremely possible" that other Las Vegas casino owners have been similarly informed by the IRS, says one Federal official. Mr. Levinson has filed suit against FBI agents and some officials of Central Telephone Co., Las Vegas, charging illegal use of listening devices in his office; last week Federal officials, claiming executive privilege, moved to bar testimony by FBI agents in the case and to block disclosure of Government documents subpoenaed by Mr. Levinson.

Federal court action against casino officials presently is limited to two individual tax cases. Desert Inn part-owner Morris B. (Moe) Dalitz, along with his accountant, Eli Boyer, was indicted last December on income tax evasion charges; they pleaded innocent and are awaiting trial. Also under indictment here in a separate tax evasion case is John Drew, a top official and part-owner of the Stardust casino, who also has pleaded innocent and awaits trial.

ANOTHER JOLT

The Federal raid that uncovered crooked gambling paraphernalia seemingly destined for Nevada has also jolted the gambling industry here. The raid took place in mid-July at the Tulsa headquarters of Kress Manufacturing Co., a maker of gambling equipment. FBI agents said some of the loaded dice and marked cards turned up carried the emblems of casinos in Las Vegas, Reno, Elko and Wells in the Lake Tahoe area.

Federal officials have made no charges that the devices were intended for use by the casinos; they could have been intended for sale as novelty items or, as some state gaming officials suggest, to professional gamblers seeking to cheat Nevada casinos. Casino owners insist it's ridiculous to think that major casinos would risk their gaming licenses by cheating customers. Nevertheless, the state gaming regulators—who in the past have revoked licenses of owners of casinos that had cheated customers—say they are "making inquiries." The Justice Department also is known to be investigating.

As a result of the skimming furor, Nevada's gaming control apparatus is being subjected to considerable questioning.

Nevada gaming control, employing some 60 persons on an annual budget of about $750,000, makes no attempt to oversee directly the counting of casino revenues on a continuing basis. State agents make only periodic spot checks in the counting rooms. The count is in the hands of casino officials, who must keep daily revenue records available to the state as well as provide quarterly revenue reports and yearly financial statements.

By contrast, in Puerto Rico, which has a relatively small legalized gaming industry, government agents oversee all casino counts. State gaming officials here say that such a system would be financially unfeasible for Nevada, requiring some 600 agents to oversee only the larger casinos on a full-time basis.

Nevertheless, at least one executive of the Nevada gambling industry, which is far from monolithic in its views, says he favors close official scrutiny of all counting operations, A. A. McCollum, president of Sahara-Nevada Corp., a Del E. Webb Corp. subsidiary that owns and operates several Nevada hotel-casinos, declares: "We'd like to have state and Federal officials supervise every count in every establishment, in person or by electronic monitoring." The Webb-owned Thunderbird Hotel already uses a closed-circuit television system for internal surveillance of the counting room and cashiers' cage; Mr. McCollum suggests Government agents could monitor the hook-up live or on tape.

Besides the charge of loose supervision of casinos' handling of cash, Nevada gaming officials are also the target of complaints that they have let a number of men with shady backgrounds—careers in illegal gambling in other states, criminal records, past friendships with known mobsters—obtain licenses as casino owners. The officials concede that some owners who won licenses in the 1950s would be rejected if they applied for licenses today, but they say that licensing standards have been tightened in recent years. There is, of course, nothing to stop state regulators from acting now to revoke licenses granted to dubious characters in past years.

SINATRA LOSES LICENSE

In addition to making more exhaustive checks of gaming license applicants, the Gaming Control Board has compiled a "black book" listing 11 top mobsters barred from the premises of Nevada gaming places. The black book isn't intended to be all-inclusive; it's simply an indication of the type of persons casinos must deny entry to, under threat of punitive action. In a highly-publicized 1963 action the state revoked entertainer Frank Sinatra's licensed ownership in two hotel-casinos after charging that he had played host to black book entry Sam Giancana, reputed Chicago Mafia chief, at Cal-Neva Lodge, which straddles the California-Nevada state line at Lake Tahoe.

The threat of an increase in the state gaming tax poses still another problem for Nevada's gambling industry. Circulating for the past 18 months has been an initiative petition that proposes roughly to triple the tax rate on casino revenue from the state's 1,726 table games and boost levies about sixfold on the take from Nevada's 28,262 slot machines.

Presently, the state's major gaming tax is a sliding scale levy of from 3% to 5.5% on gross gaming revenues. Fiscal 1966 gaming tax receipts and fees of $18.8 million were garnered from a record $328.8 million gross reported by casinos. (Nevada has neither a personal nor a corporate income tax; its biggest money raiser is a 2% sales tax, which hits tourists heavily.)

The initiative petition, started by ex-California businessman Jose Matthews of Sparks, Nev., needs 14,000 signatures, proportionally spread among 13 of Nevada's 17 counties, by a Dec. 1 deadline in order to be presented to the legislature at its next session in 1967. If rejected there, it would be offered to voters on the 1968 general election ballot. Mr. Matthews says he already has at least 14,000 signatures but may need more in some counties to satisfy the proportional requirement. Casino men and some state officials, however, are skeptical that the petition has or will get the necessary signatures.

To head off the Matthews petition and to satisfy rising demands for greater state educational expenditures, the Nevada legislature next year may move for a moderate gaming tax increase, some observers here say. Both Gov. Sawyer and his all-but-certain GOP opponent, Lt. Gov. Paul Lexalt, oppose a tax boost, but two other gubernatorial candidates are openly advocating such a move. Though none of these three candidates is given much chance of victory, the mere existence of statewide campaigns wholly or partly hostile to the gaming industry is viewed here as an important—and novel—political development.

Casino owners, predictably, claim that passage of the Matthews petition would bankrupt them and that even a more moderate tax hike would be severely damaging.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. JOHN K. WATERS, COMMANDER OF U.S. ARMY FORCES IN PACIFIC

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, it is with great regret that I learned of the retirement of Gen. John K. Waters, commander of U.S. Army Forces in the Pacific.

Special retirement ceremonies were scheduled to be held today at Fort Myer, Va., where General Waters began his Army career 35 years ago.

An outstanding military officer, General Waters was feted before departing from Honolulu a few days ago.

An article published by the Honolulu Star-Bulletin reviewed his distinguished career. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Aug. 22, 1966]

GENERAL WATERS TO END 35 YEARS OF SOLDIERING

General John K. Waters turns his back on 35 years of soldiering this week.

The outgoing commander of Army forces in the Pacific is, in a way, one of a vanishing breed of top military leaders who gained initial stature under the guns of World War II and later moved upwards to top command.

Waters will be 60 in December "and there aren't too many of us left," he said last week at Fort Shafter while discussing the relentless departure of old World War II types.

All Army units on Oahu were to turn out at 5 p.m. today at Shafter's green Palm Circle for a retreat review for Waters.

Tomorrow he and his family leave the biggest house on Palm Circle and wing off to Fort Myer, Virginia, for a retirement ceremony Wednesday. It was at Fort Myer that Waters started his Army career 35 years ago as a green second lieutenant with the 3rd Cavalry.

By Thursday he will be retired General Waters of Potomac, Maryland, not far from his Baltimore birthplace having left his Army job to General Dwight E. Beach.

Today's retreat and reception at the Officers Open Mess follows nostalgic final gatherings with the noncoms Friday and a dinner with staff officers at the Cannon Club last night.

Not long ago Waters made his final swing through the Far East with a look at the fighting man in Viet Nam.

"That was my last trip," he said later at Shafter. "There won't be any more."

Waters, distinguished by the light yellow scarf he wears at his neck, the mark of an old armored officer, came to Fort Shafter, belatedly, in March, 1964, following a heart attack at Fort Monroe, Virginia, where he had headed the U.S. Continental Army.

During his tenure at Shafter, Army strength in Viet Nam rose sharply from hundreds of advisers to thousands of combat troops including three U.S. divisions and three brigades.

The buildup meant for Waters, many trips to Viet Nam to assess the situation and frequent contact with field commanders in what is fast approaching the largest U.S. military commitment since World War II.

Yet Waters almost missed World War II.

He was a 35-year-old lieutenant colonel, No. 2 in command of an armored regiment in North Africa when he was captured by the Nazis and removed from the war.

Oddly the trying life of survival in a Stalag somehow offset the experience that otherwise would have been his through leading combat forces in battlefield engagements.

Waters' boss, General Harold K. Johnson, the Army's Chief of Staff, is likewise a former POW, a man who missed all of World War II because he had to survive the Bataan Death March.

Waters attended Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore before graduating from West Point in 1931.

He thus started an Army career in the Great Depression as did most of the other top 10 generals in today's Army.

World War II caught him on the rise, high enough in rank to lead men, not so young that he took part only in isolated incidents (as happened to John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, among others), but to have the responsibility for leading sizeable military units into action.

In the next few years Waters' contemporaries will pass from the scene leaving the military branches in the hand of men who were mere rookies, mere saplings fresh from the academies at the time of the Day of Infamy.

Waters represented both some promise and some experience when World War II came.

He fulfilled that promise but knows that, as in any profession, youth must be served.

A FAREWELL TO THE STUDENTS—ADDRESS BY REV. JAMES P. SHANNON, OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, several months ago, the College of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minn., lost a most dedicated and effective president when the Most Reverend James P. Shannon resigned on May 20 to become pastor of the Church of St. Helena in Minneapolis. Bishop Shannon's place has been filled by another excellent man, the Right Reverend Monsignor Terrence J. Murphy, who had served under Bishop Shannon as executive vice president of the college.

Because of Bishop Shannon's long and devoted service to the College of St. Thomas, and to the people of St. Paul and Minnesota, I would like to draw the attention of the Senate to the very fine farewell address which he delivered at a student convocation on May 25. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I would close only by saying that, to borrow from one of the bishop's favorite books, Plato's "Republic," it is fair to say that Bishop Cannon has achieved the "ideal of a good man, a worthy citizen, and an educated intellect, a virtuous person."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FAREWELL TO THE STUDENTS

I do not attempt to cover in your presence my very deep feeling of regret and a kind of growing sense of loneliness at the realization that within a few days I shall be leaving this campus, leaving it, not in any final sense, but in a very real sense. Walking up the steps just now a young man said to me, "Do you think you will be happy as a pastor?" Well, I do think I shall be happy as a pastor. I have been very happy as the president of this College and honored by the assignment, but you must remember that every priest is really ordained to do priestly work, and that in a sense every priest looks forward to the time when he will give his major energies to the pastoral life, the administration of the sacraments, the life of worship in a parish with his people.

THE LIBERAL ARTS: THE PURSUIT OF AN IDEAL

Having said that about myself now, I go back to a larger topic which I think should be of perennial and continuing interest to you, to our faculty, and to the people who consider Christian liberal-arts education important. Some of you are already experienced enough to have read Plato's *Republic*, some of you have not. I recommend it to all of you, particularly the seventh book of the *Republic* which describes the difference between the educated man of freedom and the man who lives his life in shadows knowing not reality but phantasms. In the *Republic* Plato is trying to delineate the ideal of a good man, a worthy citizen, an educated intellect, a virtuous person.

It has occurred to me that this is an ideal to which we have all given our allegiance on this campus, and one which might very well serve as an organizing principle for my comments to you today. This is the ideal which this Catholic liberal-arts College tries, sometimes inadequately, sometimes commendably, to put before its students and its faculty as the goal of the committed Christian concerned with and active in society.

The liberally educated man uses his time and his talent and his training to grow not only in knowledge and wisdom but also in virtue. He uses his knowledge and his wisdom for the benefit of society, to bind up the wounds of humanity, to make a contribution to the country and the state, the Church, the parish, the family, the company, the school in which he moves and lives and has his being. In proportion as our wisdom and our education is more expansive and extensive, this ideal of living becomes more attractive, stating its case eloquently to the well-educated and the well-disciplined mind. You cannot want what you do not know, and if your horizons are limited by ignorance and if you have not been introduced to the thoughts of the writers and artists and creative intellects of past generations, it is unlikely that you will ever be attracted by the ideals of beauty and grace and goodness and strength which they delineate. One of the fortunate things about being an ignorant man is that you don't know how to want these ideals. But as your horizons widen and your sensitivity to truth and beauty and goodness increase, the world of freedom and grace and poise and justice becomes more and more attractive to you. You become one of those persons influenced by his education to have a burning desire to contribute to the good life for himself and others. This is part of the explanation of why some men turn their back on lucrative careers in order to put their talents at the service of society in positions where their financial remuneration is more modest, where the chance of criticism is more frequent, and where life in general is more difficult. They do it in order to contribute to the common good.

It seems to me that an appreciation of this ideal also accounts for the readiness of other men gifted with creative and artistic talent to spend long hours and months and years and occasionally a lifetime to write poetry, to write a novel, to write a history, or to paint a picture. This is as close as they can come to keeping faith with the genius which God has given them. Entirely apart from the monetary reward or recognition from their peers in the various arts in which they work, these men move because of a kind of an interior compulsion. They strive passionately to produce something that comes close to an ideal that they have never seen

and that no man has ever seen, but which men of taste and refinement and distinction recognize as being good or true or beautiful and, therefore, desirable.

I don't know where in the process of acquiring a liberal education the glimmering appreciation of this noble standard begins to take hold of us. It would be untenable for me to maintain that every professor in this College has the talent to inspire every student with this kind of insight. No college has an oversupply of this kind of gifted or talented teacher, but every good college has some, and this College has far more than its fair share. Witness the influence of this faculty and the example of the graduates of St. Thomas in pledging their lives and their energies in many different fields to an appreciation and an extension of this ideal of the liberally educated man.

EDUCATION: PROVIDING A BASIS FOR JUDGMENT

Education is far more than information. It is in great part a habit, a facility of regularly being able to confront new information and new situations, to judge them against a reliable background of secure knowledge, and to make a decision that is necessary for you or for society on the bass of principles which you trust without question. This kind of an education, Gentlemen, would make you or me a very good citizen in any land. It would give us a body of reliable knowledge against which to judge changing contemporary situations. It would give us a facility in making difficult but necessary decisions, it would also give us a growing and deepening conviction of the ultimate reliability of those absolute values on which we predicate our lives. It is not possible to go through life with a shifting set of values. Your values may change from one period to another; you may reject some and accept or replace others, but it is not really possible to go through life with shifting values on which you make necessary judgments for your own conduct. Educators today who maintain that education is essentially a matter of continuing the search are wrong. Education should lead to some kind of reliable conclusions. The search for knowledge in itself is not the end of the human mind or the end of existence. The human mind demands some end to a series of syllogisms or experiments, and there must be some reliable conclusion to the search for knowledge. There must be some bench marks or some secure plateaus at the end of investigation which give us the kind of satisfaction which the human mind demands, and this is one of the standards by which to judge the effectiveness of your own achievement in securing a liberal education.

FREEDOM: THE OPTION TO MAKE THE WRONG CHOICE

A liberally educated person comes to have a deep, enduring concern about freedom and its necessity, but he also recognizes that with freedom comes the great burden of exercising it with discretion and with responsibility and with concern for the common good of society. In any age, the man who has more freedom than wisdom is a dangerous person. Freedom can only be used properly by men who know how to use it, and that is why education is the correlative of freedom. Lacking education or training or preparation for freedom, men often turn freedom into license.

It is the task of a college to help you and me realize the corollaries of freedom. The burden of freedom is a serious burden, and it can only safely be entrusted to men who know how to bear this burden with dignity. However, let us avoid the fallacy of those commentators who say that the function of higher education is purely intellectual. The purely intellectual product of an educational system, Gentlemen, is a monstrosity. It is a freak. There is no such thing as a purely intellectual person. You are a human being, you have a body, you have a soul, you have a mind, you have passions, you have personal weaknesses, you have personal strengths, you have ambitions, and you are qualified by your friendships and your relationship with every person you have ever known. These other factors in your personality are important to keep in mind, and the school or the college that seeks to help you get an education must be sensitive to these things.

On the matter of freedom on this campus, I should like to reiterate now a favorite theme of mine: In guiding the affairs of a college and dealing with the undergraduates in their collegiate years, it is vitally important for the administration and the faculty to recognize the integrity and the freedom of the individual student, and it is vitally important that the integrity and the freedom of the individual student be respected in decisions made concerning his conduct and his life on the campus.

I belong to the school of thought reflected in the writings and the work of Pope John XXIII which holds that every man made in the image and likeness of Christ is potentially capable of unbelievable virtue and unbelievable intellectual and moral achievement, but that in order for him to reach these heights he must reach them as a free man. He must make difficult but necessary decisions while having the option to make the wrong choice. This is the crucial point in the exercise of authority in a family, in a college, or in the Church. Do the people who finally pull the levers of power really and truly believe that one can trust freedom? If they don't, then sooner or later they resort to a kind of omniscient paternalism. I have no reason in the world on the basis of my experience to back away from my original confidence in the integrity of the students and their ability to use freedom to their advantage and to the advantage of society. When you finally come to positions of authority, the crisis for you will be whether you can keep faith with this belief in freedom after you have the power to make the system go the other way. It isn't any great trick, Gentlemen, to have wild theories on freedom at your age. The question is what grand and enlightened views will you have on this subject when you actually control the destinies of other people, be it your children, your students, or the people in your constituency. There is no such thing as a little bit of freedom. On a given issue either you are free or you are not free. If you are not free somebody else makes the decisions, and if you are free you make the decisions. There are people in education, there are people in the Church, there are people in society, who do not subscribe to the notion of freedom I am describing to you here today. But at the end of ten years of experience on this campus, with a faculty in which a layman enjoys more freedom, more authority, more voice, than any college faculty I know, the fruit is evident—this College is better and stronger because of the responsible exercise of that freedom. The best evidence of the merits of a free society and a free man is the remarkable achievements which free men educated to their responsibility can make, not only for themselves, but also for their society.

A GRATEFUL LEAVE-TAKING: FROM COLLEGE TO PARISH

I want to come back now to a few personal considerations. I am honored at the prospect of being a member of the Board of Trustees, and I am simply delighted at the appointment of Monsignor Murphy as the new president of this College. I look forward to the opportunity to work closely with him for the good of St. Thomas and for your good. I have given ten years of the best effort I have to your education, to the improvement of the academic reputation of St. Thomas, and to the acquiring of those physical facilities which would make the work of the faculty and of the students easier. They have been years of considerable achievement for the College. I am proud of what we have been able to accomplish. I am grateful for the support that the students, the faculty, the Board, the Archbishop, the priests, and the parishes of this Archdiocese have given to me.

I now turn my attention to my parochial affairs. I am told by the real estate agents in Minneapolis that there are many lovely homes in St. Helena's parish, and when you marry those young women from the College of St. Catherine come and see me. You need not come to register at St. Helena's Parish, but if you come, be a good parishioner and ask for a set of envelopes.

God bless you.

SENATOR GRUENING COMMENDED

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we have often been fortunate in the Senate to have the benefit of the wisdom of our colleague, Senator GRUENING, on the complicated foreign policy issues confronting us in literally every part of the globe. Yesterday, Senator GRUENING addressed himself, and our attention, to "Our Obsolete Concepts About NATO—1949 Solutions for 1966 Facts."

I found myself in agreement with much of Senator GRUENING's statement. In particular, I would like to associate myself with his appeal for some official "rethinking" about NATO. As my colleagues here know, I have devoted some attention to this subject myself and my conclusions and recommendations regarding our policy toward our Western European allies—conclusions and recommendations which followed from a study mission to Western Europe in early May—were contained in a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations entitled "Europe Today."

Senator GRUENING made some generous comments about my report yesterday. I would like to thank him for his kind remarks. He is a welcome ally in the ranks of those of us who feel that, if we are to play a meaningful role in Europe, our policy must stay relevant. I will have more to say on this subject soon.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S CHANGING MOODS ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, in the Detroit Free Press of Sunday, August 21, an article written by Robert Boyd explored in considerable detail the history of the administration's changing, fluctuating moods in regard to the war in Vietnam. The pendulum, it said, has swung in a wide arc over the past several years between official gloom and official optimism.

At the present time, the administration seems to be optimistic and confident, at least insofar as our military operations in Vietnam are concerned.

But significantly, Mr. Boyd's article concluded by recalling a quote of the late John F. Kennedy which warned against the dangers of officially lulling the American people in regard to the difficulties which still lie ahead. Also significantly, at the same time the administration is now wearing its mantle of optimism, predictions are flowing from

the President on down that we must still commit massive additional groundpower in Vietnam. We have even seen forecasts in print that American troops face virtually a whole new and bitter war in the Mekong Delta region of South Vietnam.

Under these circumstances, it is no wonder that a wide confidence gap has developed between the President and the people of this Nation. The people are learning, almost by the day, that there is often a vast difference between truth and controlled news, between fact and official pronouncement, between political mood and the realities of war.

Out of this credibility gap is growing a public fear that we are now caught in a serious leadership gap in regard to Vietnam. While the optimism flows, we still have no effective, major allied support for our ultimate objectives in the war, or for our immediate military efforts there. While we are told from the highest level that the Communists cannot win, we still have not persuaded our allies to stop shipping goods into Communist ports.

And for months we have been hearing predictions that the President would launch some dramatic move either to win the war or win the peace, or both, before the November elections—yet he said just a few days ago he has no new plans on the diplomatic front to help achieve a satisfactory negotiated peace.

I have supported the concept of an all-Asian foreign ministers conference to explore possible means of achieving peace. Others and I have urged the President to call for such a conference. Perhaps that conference would be nothing more than a beginning—perhaps it would even fail as other peace efforts have failed—but such a call by the President now at least would be an indication to the American people that the leadership gap is being closed.

Any such indication would justify new public confidence in the administration's fluctuating moods concerning Vietnam. With any progress toward solidifying our allies in this common cause, there would be greater American confidence in the policies which govern our military efforts there.

Until that confidence is restored, I am afraid the pendulum will continue to swing between official gloom and official optimism—and much of the American public will go right on doubting that the administration's words are anything more than politically motivated toward the November elections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Boyd's article, "Pendulum Reports Own Cheery-Gloomy Swings," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON VIETNAM: PENDULUM REPORTS OWN CHEERY-GLOOMY SWINGS

(By Robert Boyd)

WASHINGTON.—Shortly after church last Sunday, President Johnson strolled out on the lawn of his Texas ranch and declared that a communist victory in South Vietnam is now "impossible."

Twenty-four hours later, the Marine Commandant, after a trip to the fighting zone, told a Pentagon news conference: "We can and will win this war."

These were the latest in a long string of confident pronouncements by government leaders which have punctuated the nation's slide into a major land war in Asia.

When the string began, the U.S. had less than 700 soldiers in Vietnam. We have nearly 300,000 there now, and the President said in his after-church talk Sunday that still more will have to go.

Nearly every step up the ladder of escalation has been accompanied by encouraging noises from high administration officials.

Even in the bleakest days of 1964 and early 1965, when the communists came within inches of overrunning South Vietnam, there were periodic expressions of official optimism.

As a result, the public record is studded with phrases like "further progress" (1962), "will be successful" (1963), "steady improvement" (1964), "we have stopped losing" (1965), and "we are gaining" (1966).

Understandably, critics of the President's war policies try to make hay out of this. For example, a report by the Republican National Committee last week, entitled "Vietnam—Crisis of Confidence", charged:

"From the beginning, official government pronouncements have frequently had little similarity to the grim realities of the Vietnam conflict. While the situation in Vietnam was, in fact, steadily deteriorating . . . the American public was being treated to a steady diet of rosy predictions and misleading statements."

Also understandably, administration spokesmen counter that the optimistic statements cited by critics were torn out of context, with the "ifs" and "buts" ignored.

Earlier this year, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara gave Congress a list of 59 statements he had made on Vietnam since 1963. About half of them are encouraging; about half pessimistic.

(Secretary of State Dean Rusk's utterances have been generally quite cautious. President Johnson, personally, has rarely indulged in public optimism.)

A study of the record shows that the government's public declarations on the war over the past 10 years have gone through a series of alternating ups and downs.

In the late 1950's there was cheer, which changed to gloom in 1960 when the communists launched their campaign to capture the South. Confidence returned in late 1961, but the bottom dropped out again at the end of 1963, after the assassination of South Vietnam President Ngo Dinh Diem.

We are currently in an up-phase, which began with the defeat of the big communist summer offensive in 1965. Officials, wary now of being accused of over-optimism, refuse to predict how long it will last.

It's going to be a long war, but we'll win it in the end, is the current administration line.

Here is the zig-zag course traced by official optimism—"Hopeful's Progress."

CHEERY PHASE I

The departure of the French colonialists from Indo-China in 1954, and the division of Vietnam into northern and southern halves, led to a few years of relative stability.

Under President Diem, South Vietnam's economy boomed. The then Senator John F. Kennedy, in his book "Strategy of Peace," written in 1959, called it "a near miracle."

Sen. MIKE MANSFIELD, now Democratic Majority Leader and a Vietnam pessimist, said in an official report in February, 1960, that the South had "made great progress . . . in internal security . . . in popularly responsible government . . . and in the advancement of the welfare of the people."

In October, 1960, President Eisenhower sent a congratulatory letter to President Diem: "In five short years, the Vietnamese people have developed their country in almost every sector," Ike said. "I am confident that . . . determination and boldness will meet the renewed threat."

GLOOMY PHASE I

In 1959, however, North Vietnam President Ho Chi Minh had announced a plan to "liberate" South Vietnam. In December, 1960, the communist "National Liberation Front" (Vietcong) was formed, and large-scale guerrilla warfare began.

By the time Kennedy took over the White House the situation was becoming critical. The Vietcong were "bleeding Vietnam to death," according to White House Aide Theodore Sorensen.

Kennedy set up a special task force on Vietnam, dispatched Vice President Lyndon Johnson on a fact-finding mission, and told Congress that guerillas had assassinated 4,000 Vietnamese officials in the past 12 months.

Kennedy rejected his generals' advice to send troops to Vietnam, but stepped up the military advisory team to 2,000 men. In December, 1961, the State Department issued a grim "White Paper" labeling the Vietnam situation "a threat to peace."

CHEERY PHASE II

The extra assistance seemed to help. As U.S. forces rose to 15,000 men, official pronouncements took on a rosy tinge:

On Jan. 17, 1962, Secretary McNamara said, "Actions taken there have proved effective."

On May 12, he said, "Progress in the last eight to 10 weeks has been great."

On July 25, he said, "I continue to be encouraged. There are many signs indicating progress."

By the time of his State of the Union report to Congress in January, 1963, Kennedy hopefully announced: "The spearpoint of aggression has been blunted in South Vietnam."

And on Oct. 2, 1963, the White House issued a statement quoting McNamara as declaring: "The major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965 . . . by the end of this year (1963), 1,000 U.S. military personnel assigned to South Vietnam can be withdrawn."

This was the high point of official optimism. Within three months, the withdrawal plan had to be publicly scrapped.

GLOOMY PHASE II

On Nov. 2, 1963, President Diem was assassinated. The shuffle of cardboard governments began in Saigon. Taking advantage of the weakness in the South, the communists stepped up their terrorism and began moving large scale fighting units in from the North. An 18-month slide toward disaster was underway.

Official statements during this period generally admit the gravity of the situation, but sprinkle notes of encouragement through the gloom.

On Dec. 31, 1963, McNamara returned from the war zone to report, "We have every reason to believe (our plans) will be successful."

On March 17, after another flying trip, he said, "There unquestionably have been setbacks," but asserted "the situation can be significantly improved in the coming months."

On May 14, after a third quickie trip, McNamara said, "I firmly believe . . . our assistance will lead to success."

The ups and downs continued through the following months as the war went from bad to worse, and U.S. troop levels rose past 50,000.

On Oct. 22, 1964, McNamara told a press conference "the military situation is serious."

But a month later, he told reporters, "Today as compared with a month or two ago, we can look ahead with greater confidence."

Between February and April, 1965, McNamara consistently characterized the situation as "grave but far from hopeless."

In May, he said, "in the last eight weeks there has been an improvement." But in July, he told reporters in Saigon: "There has been a deterioration since I was here last."

CHEERY PHASE III

In July, 1965, President Johnson ordered another major step-up in combat forces, from 75,000 to 125,000 men. The long-awaited major communist summer offensive was broken. The line changed to one of "cautious optimism."

By November, 1965, McNamara felt bold enough to announce: "We have stopped losing the war." He added, however, that "the road ahead will be long and hard" and "victory will most likely take many years."

In March, 1966, when the U.S. had committed more than 215,000 troops in Vietnam, there came a brief, anxious setback. Anti-government Buddhist rioting "unquestionably" set back the war effort for two months this spring, McNamara admitted.

But by June, with over 250,000 Americans on the scene, the situation had stabilized again, and the flow of official confidence resumed.

The spring crisis had demonstrated, however, the shakiness of the platform on which U.S. hopes rest. At any time, skeptics say, a new government crisis in Saigon could tumble the whole house of cards.

Back in April, 1954, John Kennedy, then a junior Senator gave a speech on the current Indo-China crisis in which he criticized French and American generals for "predictions of confidence which have lulled the American people."

More than 12 years later, similar predictions are still rolling forth.

SCHOOLS WANT RETURN OF VOLUNTARY PRAYER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senate will soon be called upon to take action on the voluntary prayer amendment. In the hearings which were held earlier this month in the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments a wide range of testimony was presented.

Some witnesses told us of the large number of schools which had permitted voluntary prayer in their classes for generations. This was by custom and practice on decision from the school boards. Some of them traced this back for a hundred and more years. The Supreme Court changed this situation very summarily. These schools want the former custom and practice restored to its previous state.

Other testimony showed that school boards have placed differing interpretations on the Supreme Court decision. Some extended it to include a ban on singing the last verse of "America;" also "God Bless America," and even recital of the Pledge to the Flag because it contains the words "one nation, under God" in its text. Still other school boards are forbidding any reference to Christmas or Easter or Thanksgiving because these days have a religious origin and meaning. How bleak the schools would be without this warming and very religious background and history which these activities bring to the hearts and minds of the schoolchildren.

It is in this field that the voluntary prayer amendment would provide clarification. It would provide that school boards could permit voluntary participation in prayers. School boards could not prescribe the form of such prayers. For school districts where there would be resentment or sharp difference of opinion on the subject, the rule would be the same as it always has been heretofore, namely, that there would be no such voluntary prayers.

One of the finest witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee was the Reverend Robert G. Howes, associate professor at the Catholic University of America, who represented the Citizens for Public Prayer in the Massachusetts area. As a member of the subcommittee, I was deeply impressed with the content of his testimony and the manner in which it was delivered.

The statement which Father Howes submitted deals effectively and comprehensively with all of the objections which have been raised against the amendment. It strongly emphasizes the need for the amendment and the wide support which exists for its adoption.

In order that the Members of the Senate will have an opportunity to study the statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Massachusetts area affiliate of the Citizens for Public Prayer is headquartered in Rutland, Mass. I am indebted to Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN for his courtesy in deferring to me in the matter of placing this statement in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF REV. ROBERT G. HOWES, REPRESENTING THE CITIZENS FOR PUBLIC PRAYER, AUGUST 5, 1966

(Rev. Robert G. Howes, Associate Professor, the Catholic University of America, Member, Board of Governors, Constitutional Prayer Foundation; Washington, D.C., Representative, Citizens for Public Prayer, Massachusetts Area, Box 1776, Rutland, Massachusetts 01543. This testimony is the official statement of Citizens for Public Prayer, its Michigan and New York Area affiliates as well as its Massachusetts affiliate. Father Howes is also testifying in behalf of the Dirksen Peoples Amendment for Public Prayer officially in the name of i) Most Rev. Bernard J. Flanagan, D.D., Roman Catholic Bishop of Worcester, Massachusetts, ii) The Diocesan Council of Catholic Women, Worcester, Massachusetts and iii) The Honorable George Wells, Mayor of the City of Worcester, Massachusetts as well as officially for those many individuals, elected officials and boards who have expressed themselves across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts supporting the Peoples Amendment for Public Prayer.)

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

These twenty-two simple yes beautiful words, says the United States Supreme Court, are unconstitutional. We come, with respect but also with a serious urgency, asking passage of a Peoples' amendment for public prayer which will forever reverse this tragic judgment. We come, in the name of those many Americans who have joined us, to speak a loud thanks to Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Congressman Frank J. Becker, and those other Senators and Representatives who now and before have led this great grass-roots effort. We come before you today convinced that the two "prayer" decisions are very seriously wrong and that, quite beyond their apparent localization, they place precedents which must, if the Court is true to its own logic, destroy one by one each surviving instance of public reverence among us. We come, as Abraham Lincoln came once one hundred years ago to the bar of public opinion in the matter of Dred Scott, convinced that for all the fine words and nice dicta, what counts is the sheer deed of these decisions. And the deed of the decisions in present question is an absurdity, contradictory at once to the sustained national customs and the clear will of the American people! We come certain that unless and until a reasonable prayer amendment is proposed to the nation, democracy is mocked and Americans everywhere must continue to wonder if this Hill is indeed a place where their voices are responsively heard. Because, gentlemen, now as seldom before those voices are loud, and united, around us here!

Perhaps one of the most important aspects of the matter now before us is its critical time dimension. Seldom have so many Americans been so patient and yet so insistent for so long in so basic an issue. Seldom has the nation, united as almost never in any previous peacetime, had cause to doubt the democracy as it has here. Four years ago on this side of the Hill, and two years ago on the House side, hearings were held to the same overall purpose for which we now meet. And yet still the clear national will to reverse the tragic precedents set down in the two Supreme Court "prayer" decisions has failed even to reach the floor in either chamber!

Two years back, when a nearly successful discharge petition forced hearings in the House Judiciary Committee, I was privileged to share very closely in the prayer amendment drive. I worked then with the two prayer defense attornies, the Honorable Bertram B. Daiker of Port Washington, New York, and the Honorable Francis B. Burch of Baltimore, Maryland, and, especially, with Congressman Frank J. Becker of New York and his many associates in the House. Even more importantly, I talked to and corresponded with literally thousands of Americans who believe as I do in the right of public prayer. This I note in no sense of pride, because, while we certainly did not lose our case at that time, after an unconscionable lapse of two years, the House Judiciary Committee has still reported out no prayer bill, I put it down rather to suggest the context in which I now testify.

As the people of America rally once again for prayer, I believe these conclusions emerge from a time-view of the amendment effort:

1. Far from subsiding, the intention of the nation, tested in the usual fashion, remains very strongly pro-amendment. Two years ago, in our testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, we had detailed the wide extent of popular support for a prayer amendment.[1] The very day present hearings were announced, the same issue of "The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD" carried the results of a poll in the home district of Congressman McDADE. This poll evidences two important things.[2] 90% of those responding favored a prayer amendment. There were fewer undecided votes on the prayer question than on any other matter. Senator DIRKSEN himself has said.[3]

[1] See *School Prayers*, House Judiciary Hearings 1964, Part II, pages 986–1032.

[2] "The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD", July 13, 1966, p. 15484.

[3] "The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD", May 24, 1966, p. 11243.

"Insofar as I can determine, more than 81% of the people disagree with the courts. Two weeks ago, one man came to Washington and dumped 52,000 letters of protest on my desk. Prayer groups are organizing. Sooner or later Congress must come to grips with this matter."

In October of 1964, the nationally known Lou Harris Poll indicated that well over 80% of the American people favor a prayer amendment. There are these further indications:

a. Polling his home district ("The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD", April 6, 1966, p. 7944):

"Do you favor a constitutional amendmend to permit Bible reading in public schools?"

Yes, 81 percent; no, 19 percent. Almost everybody has an opinion either pro or con about Bible reading. Only 2.4 percent of the people . . . failed to answer this question.

The Honorable ROBERT J. CORBETT (MC, Pennsylvania)

b. Polling his home district ("The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD", May 16, 1966, p. 10724):

"Do you favor a constitutional amendment to allow voluntary prayer and Bible reading in public schools?"

Yes, 77.5%; no, 22.5%

The Honorable JOEL BROYHILL (MC, Virginia)

c. Polling his home district ("The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD", June 2, 1966, p. 12224):

"Do you favor a constitutional amendment permitting prayer in public schools?"

Yes, 83.4%; no, 10.8%

The Honorable E. C. GATHINGS (MC, Arkansas)

d. Polling his home district ("The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD", June 15, 1966, p. 13337):

For a prayer amendment. 81.22%

The Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN (Connecticut)

e. Polling his home district ("The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD", June 9, 1966, p. 12928):

"Do you favor a constitutional amendment to restore prayer in public schools?"

Yes 81.2% No 16.8%

The Honorable E. ROSS ADAIR (Indiana)

f. Polling his home district ("The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD", July 18, 1966, p. 16096):

"Do you favor a constitutional amendment to allow voluntary prayer and Bible reading in public schools?" Yes 82.8%

The Honorable HASTINGS KEITH (Massachusetts).

In fact, on a recent national Columbia Broadcasting System TV Poll, the American people spoke with greater unanimity to a prayer amendment than to any other polled position. Clearly the nation at its grass roots has sustained its original conviction that the Supreme Court was seriously wrong in its "prayer" decisions and that radical remedial action is essential.

2. Once again here in the Senate, as before in the House, an unusually large and diverse number of members backs the prayer amendment effort. Once again, too, this impressive sponsorship is backed by a great many responsible Americans. In June of 1966, for instance, the National Conference of Mayors, meeting in Texas, resolved for the prayer amendment. On February 8 and February 14, 1966, respectively, the Massachusetts House of Representatives repeated its action of two years back, in conjunction with the Massachusetts Senate, and sent to the Congress this resolution:

"Whereas it is the will and desire of the majority of our citizens to recognize the existence of God and our dependence on Him; and

"Whereas the recital of voluntary prayers in our public schools will accomplish that purpose and will help maintain traditions cherished by so many of our citizens: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation presenting to the States a proposed constitutional amendment permitting the recital of a non-sectarian prayer in our public schools."

In "The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD," June 6, 1966, at pages 12325–12329, two detailed pro-amendment resolutions by the legislature of the State of Maryland are carried in full. I ask permission that the text of these resolutions be included as part of our testimony. In "The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD," June 6, 1966, at page 12325, a similar concurrent resolution by the legislature of the State of Louisiana is carried in full. I ask permission that the text of this resolution be included as part of our testimony. In "The daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD", April 25, 1966, the Honorable HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts, spells out prayer amendment support on the part of the City and Council and Most Rev. Bernard J. Flanagan DD., Roman Catholic bishop, of Worcester, Massachusetts. I ask permission that the text of Congressman DONOHUE's remarks, at page A2223 of the said issue be included as part of our testimony. In "The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD", June 2, 1966, at pages 12231–12232, the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., of Massachusetts, details support for the Dirksen amendment effort by that great Churchman, Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston. I ask permission that the text of Congressman O'NEILL's remarks be included as part of our testimony.

Also recorded for a prayer amendment are, among others: a. the national Governors Conference b. the National Jaycees c. Bishop Fulton J. Sheen d. Dr. Billy Graham e. the National Council of Catholic Youth, f. the Disabled American Veterans g. the immediate past president of the Worcester, Massachusetts, Council of Churches, Dr. Malcolm Matheson, h. the Baltimore, Maryland, Presbytery, i. the National Conference of Mayors in its June 1966 convention.

3. Educators, parents and children across America continue in a quandary as to what can and what cannot be done to accommodate what some feel to be the ambiguous mandate of the Supreme Court in the "prayer" decisions. Usually, the decision is made to avoid rather than to dare, when any conceivable question arises as to this or that reverent practise in the public class-room. Can the 5th stanza of "The Star Spangled Banner" or the 4th stanza of "America" now be constitutionally sung by public school children? Is a simple kindergarten prayer which mentions the Deity constitutionally possible? What about Christmas, carols, manger scenes? Must graduating classes hum when the word God occurs in a commencement song? The whole point is—there survives a serious confusion and the resolution of that confusion, even by well-meaning school boards, seems to be rather on the side of ruling God out rather than letting a controversial God into the public class-room.

4. The minimalists—many of whom have read but all of whom have seriously underestimated the two "prayer" decisions—contend that the Court actually decided only a very limited issue and that there are, in any case, valid alternatives to the moment of prayer which can be used in the public school. In fact, the Court decided a maximum issue, placed a fatal equation which, if developed logically and consistently applied, must operate to destroy every surviving instance of public reverence in the land. In sustaining their demand for a prayer amendment, the American people give clear evidence that they recognize this essential harm in the "prayer" decisions. In rallying once more to the cause of public prayer, the American people demonstrate again their ability to penetrate through the dicta, the high words, and the incidental remarks of these decisions and to discover their fundamental mistake. As the Supperintendent of Public Education in a large State told us, if the conclusion is so ridiculous, there must be something seriously wrong in the premises. The American people do not understand the complexities of legal semantics. The American people cannot follow this debate in all its detail. But the American people know that free, non-denominational prayer has been barred to their children in the public school. And the American people know that this barring is a clear threat to those other practises of public reverence which they hold dear. Among those who concur with the nation:

a. Henry P. Van Dusen, former President of the Union Theological Seminary, New York City (letter published in "The New York Times", July 7, 1963):

"The corollary in both law and logic of the Supreme Court's recent interdictions is inescapable, prohibition of the affirmative recognition and collaboration by government at all levels with all organs of religion in all relationships and circumstances. A consistent application of such a policy would involve a revolution in the Nation's habitual practice in the matter of religion . . . Nothing less than this is at stake."

b. Rev. Dr. D. Elton Trueblood, professor of philosophy at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, has written—"This is a ruling which affects deeply the whole of American life and represents a radical change in the cultural pattern in many parts of the Nation." Because Dr. Trueblood's remarks are so very pertinent, I ask that they be included in full as part of our testimony. Reference—"Presbyterian Life," issue of May 1964.

e. In a fine editorial on June 18, 1963, the official publication of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Boston, Massachusetts, wrote under the heading:

"ALL PUBLIC LIFE AFFECTED

"The same tedious arguments emphasizing the 'establishment of religion' clause are brought forth to support a position which turns its back on the total American tradition and outlaws the present practices of 39 States. Let us suppose that the Lord's Prayer and the Bible are excluded from the American public schools, for precisely the reasons given by the Supreme Court. *What is the next step? Clearly, all other expressions of religion in public life must now be deleted.* Let us not wait for them to come up case by case, but in one single gesture let them be suppressed."

As for alternatives, two things must be noted. First, no matter how valid any so-called alternative may be, it does absolutely nothing, and this is critically important, to repeal the precedents which now stand in the law of the land. Second, we have discovered no regular provision in most of our public schools of any acceptable substitute for the moment of prayer. We shall talk to each of the proposed substitutes later in our testimony. Suffice it here to reiterate that even where initial efforts in this direction have been essayed, they remain so very extraordinary as to attract national attention. They are not in any case the rule, but clearly a limited exception. Again, it must be stressed, even an almost perfect substitute for the moment of prayer would leave the tragic precedents of the "prayer" decisions untouched and this is where reversal is imperative.

In short, time adds a critical dimension to the matter now before us. First, a clear and increasingly serious challenge to the democratic process has been placed. Second, the fact is more and more evident as further court cases are brought, as well as from the statements of some of those who initially pushed for the prayer ban, that the two "prayer" decisions are by no means minimal, narrow judgments, but rather very fundamental precedents which (even with their

pleasant dicta) can and will be used in a widening attack against other instances of public reverence. Third, the massive national will for a prayer amendment survives and is backed by many responsible Americans, as individuals and as organizations. Fourth, what is obviously now required is not the prolongation of debate, a debate long since fully joined, but the immediate proposition to the American people at their several State Capitals of a reasonably worded constitutional prayer amendment. What is now required is not an affirmative substantive vote in the Congress on the merits of school prayer, but rather a specific piece of enabling legislation which will permit the nation to decide this basic issue. We have no doubt whatsoever that, given their rightful chance, the American people will decide overwhelmingly for public reverence. We challenge our opponents to take their cause, as we have our's, to the people.

The question is repeatedly asked, sometimes in honesty, many times to confuse, but what is so important about the moment of prayer? Why are you fighting so hard to have this moment restored in our public schools? The answer of course is neither quick nor simple. But two things are clear. First, the effort here is not for school prayer alone but rather to arrest once and for all at the prayer point a process of secularism which, unless radically checked, must erode away all public reverence. Second, while the moment of prayer by itself will not change the face or the soul of America, it is strikingly evident to the great majority of the American people that it remains a most valuable experience in reasonable pluralism and must survive.

It is always difficult, as one examines the record of man through history, to decide just exactly when a process of deterioration sets in which could have been checked had responsible corporate action been taken. It is equally difficult to judge the instant in any such process at which a most effective intervention on the part of the public could have been mounted. If, God forbid, the time should arrive when the religious inheritance of this nation must lie dead like Lenin in a cold mausoleum, when the children of this nation must divide their learning lives into two parts—a private part where God can come, a public part where He cannot come, when God has become only the lares and penates of Rome again—personal deities who stand in temples and sequestered domestic corners but is denied admittance to courts, legislatures and other civic assemblies and instruments—then surely these two "prayer" decisions must be ranked in the list of key precedents and the opinion must validly lie that a strong public intervention here could have halted the tragic process.

There are those who tell us this is neither the time nor the place for remedial action. You should either a) have attacked earlier b) attack later or c) object elsewhere—they continue. We rejoice, of course, that this miniscule elite has somehow discovered a superior wisdom in these critical matters. For ourselves, we cannot believe that the American people have made a mistake by rallying, as they have seldom rallied before, to the cause of prayer in the public school. It is not for us to suggest to the nation that its legal expertise at this point is faulty. It is for us to recognize that, for better or for worse, upwards of 80% of our fellow citizens have reached a moment of basic decision. We deal here with the penny on the pound of tea. Undoubtedly, there were those in Boston 200 years ago who told the patriotic "Indians"—don't throw the tea into the harbor, don't fight the tax, it's not important, this is neither the time nor the place for remedial action! But the moment of decision had arrived in that great colonial Boston. How and why it did, at that particular instant in the night in Boston harbor, we don't presume to know. How and why the American people, so often distinct from those who should be leading them, have recognized that this is the moment when they must resolve once and for all the great issue of public reverence, we don't presume to know. One thing we do know—this is it, Minute Men from plain places across America have converged on the minute now before you.

What is so significant about the moment of prayer? In our Appendix I, we are proud to include pertinent excerpts from the splendid text "This Nation Under God", by Fordham Professor Rev. Joseph Costanzo S.J. Harvard Law School Dean Erwin N. Griswold adds this important dimension:

"The child of a nonconforming or minority group is, to be sure, different in his beliefs. That is what it means to be a member of a minority. Is it not desirable, and educational, for him to learn and observe this, in the atmosphere of the school not so much that he is different, as that other children are different from him? And is it not desirable that, at the same time, he experiences and learns the fact that his difference is tolerated and accepted? No compulsion is put upon him. He need not participate. But *he, too, has the opportunity to be tolerant.* (Italic supplied.) He allows the majority of the group to follow their own tradition, perhaps coming to understand and to respect what they feel is significant to them. Is not this a useful and valuable and educational and, indeed, a spiritual experience for the children of what I have called the majority group? They experience the values of their own culture; but they also see that there are others who do not accept these values, and that they are wholly tolerated in their nonacceptance. Learning tolerance for other persons, no matter how different, and respect for their beliefs, may be an important part of American education, and wholly consonant with the First Amendment. I hazard the thought that no one would think otherwise were it not for parents who take an absolutist approach to the problem, perhaps encouraged by the absolutist expressions of Justices of the Supreme Court, on and off the bench."

Because of their excellent statement of our own feelings in re the majority-minority aspects of school prayer, I ask permission that the full text of Dean Griswold's remarks be included as part of our testimony. See Griswold, "Absolute in the Dark", 8 Utah Law Review, p. 167 ff. (1963). But if the moment of prayer in a public school is important, its denial is also important. Seldom has this fact been more sensitively explored than in another excellent text "The Supreme Court and Public Prayer", authored in 1964 by Fordham University Law professor, Charles E. Rice, and published by the Fordham University Press. I ask that chapter IV of this text, "Can Government be Neutral", pages 73–81, be included as part of our testimony.

The question—but whose prayer shall be used—is a question which has been again and again dragged across our path as we fight for the return of prayer to the public school. There are those who raise it honestly. There are others who keep raising it even after it has been repeatedly answered. The sincerity of those people is, most surely, open to doubt. Whose prayer? We might return the question—whose prayer was in fact used for decades in state after state across these United States in public classrooms with a minimum of objection? The whole point is that in this as in such other intricate issues as civil rights, loyalty, public economies—we must recognize the difficulty of exact language but not stop there. We have got, quite simply, to proceed here as we do in those other issues. The starting-place is not language but the sheer need for action to accomplish a necessary purpose. There is no doubt whatsoever of the requirement for care and expert deliberation as we frame a prayer amendment. But what an utter tragedy it would be if for want of a reasonable consensus about words, the nation were to be deprived of public prayer! What an utter tragedy it would be if, after having found reasonable solutions to other complex problems, no reasonable solution could be found to this! Whose prayer? We remain convinced that the American people, in their native good sense and through their traditional educational instrumentalities, will as they have in the past answer this question with a maximum of wisdom and a barest minimum of mistake. But, our opponents continue, suppose there should be a Buddhist majority in a given school district, or a Roman Catholic majority? Won't this majority elect for a Buddhist, or Roman Catholic prayer? Such a question represents, in our judgment, a pitiful underestimation of the American people. To suggest that a sectarian majority would be so callous, so unconcerned for the rights of its neighbors that it would enable a strictly denominational prayer in the public schools of its community is, in a very real sense, a slander on the record of the nation. We are certain, particularly in our day of generous pluralism, that the question of whose prayer will be answered wisely as the great rule in all our school districts. And, even where there might happen a rare exception, a remedy will still lie in the courts and in nonparticipation.

At the very base of our position here is the conviction that the two "prayer" decisions are seriously inimical to the interests and the explicit will of the reverent majority of this nation. Our opponents ask—but why then are so many men of "religious" identity supporting them? We respect, of course, honest difference of opinion. We do not respect the culpable ambiguity of some "men of religion" who have either (a) adverted to the admitted difficulty of wording a responsible prayer amendment and then absented themselves, now for years from the counsel of those who, here on the Hill and elsewhere, have been patiently trying to come up with just such an amendment, or (b) spoken words of uncertainty to constituents who were desperately concerned for a clear trumpet in this critical matter.

We believe, too, it must now be strongly noted, that if our polls, as indicated in this testimony, are accurate, some of those who have come here with titles, ostensibly speaking for religious groups, are in fact generals without armies. They may have staffs and public relation offices. They do not have their own congregants with them. One of my most inspiring moments two years ago was to sit in Congressman Becker's office on the other side of the Hill and read the letters that poured in after one or another of the generals without armies had spoken to the House Judiciary Committee against prayer. Again and again, Americans everywhere protested—he did not represent me even though I am a member of the congregation whose title he bears! We submit, respectfully, that this is a matter of principal significance as the Committee weighs these days of testimony. It is simply impossible that upwards of 80% of the American people support our position and at the same time some so-called "religious leaders" are in fact representing that people in opposing this position. Again, while respecting honest difference of opinion, we believe that the cause of religion in these United States is very seriously hurt by the two "prayer" decisions. When, as Mr. Justice Stewart strongly implies, and others have explicitly stated, a "religion of secularism", an official position favoring the nonbeliever over the believer, is blessed with government endorsement, then we have entered indeed into a game of Russian roulette with our reverent practices and tradition. There

is simply no saying which must next take the fatal judicial shot. The greater tragedy, though, is that so-called "religious leaders" have blinded themselves to the danger and have gone chasing after pleasant dicta while the deed of the decision penetrates through to the most ordinary American who joins us in denouncing it.

We are asked also—but doesn't religion belong in the family and home and church, not in the school? The answer to this is so simple that those who keep asking it must now be suspect. Religion belongs, of course, in family, home and altar place; but it belongs also in the class-room where the bulk of America's young people approach the arts and sciences of life for the first time. Religion is not strengthened in the heart and head of a youngster by wiping it off his lips. There is no conceivable connection as between a public class-room barren of reverence and a resurgence of religion in other aspects of our life together. Besides, as we have indicated above, that brotherhood of prayer which for so long in so many places distinguished our people, is an important experience in pluralism which cannot be duplicated by a God concerned at the hearth and sectarian altar.

A number of supposed substitutions for the moment of prayer have been suggested. We talk to them here, briefly. Let it be clear from the beginning that, should the incredible happen and the will of the nation fail to survive here on the Hill in the matter of a prayer amendment, we shall require to gather the crusts which may for a time remain behind for reverent parents to feed their public school children on. Our attitude to the supposed substitutions, then is this. First, none is really adequate. Second, none, even the most perfect, will in any way eradicate the tragic precedent of the two "prayer" decisions. Third, even though some emasculated type of reverence may for a time survive, we are convinced that each meaningful experience of religion in public schools stands now under a shadow and must, if the Court is true to itself, be seriatim banned. One suggestion as replacement for school prayer is a silent moment of meditation. A quiet God is better than no God, that is true. But a quiet God removes that experience in pluralism which a spoken God encourages. Besides, meditation is a difficult thing even for adults. To suppose that grade school youngsters can accomplish it properly is at best illusive. Interestingly enough, the same session of the Massachusetts General Court (legislature) which permitted silent meditation petitioned the Congress for a prayer amendment, thus recognizing that its earlier action was purely a holding operation and not definitive in the case. Another suggested replacement is comparative religion class. We wonder if this can be really achieved. It is not difficult to foresee the need for Solomonian teachers to relate one religion to another, nor the rapidity with which enemies of our children's God will rise to challenge such a class in courts whose record is clear. A third suggestion is religion as part of art and history. And religion belongs in art and history, but what a tragedy it would be if God could come into a public school only as a foot-note in art and history classes! Still another suggestion is for a kind of moral assembly in which God might just possibly squeeze in between quotations from Ben Franklin, Einstein, Thoreau and others. But is this enough? Why must the reverent millions of American parents settle for this intermittent God? No, and the record is evident for all to see, no effective substitute has yet been proposed and widely practiced. Such cases as do exist are so very rare as to attract national attention. And, again, no matter how valid the substitute, it would do nothing to repeal the tragic precedents now in place and the more valid it was the more chance there would be of its judicial denial.

Perhaps one of the most curious arguments, used in at least one major church correspondence of my knowledge to forestall action in support of the Peoples' Amendment for Public Prayer, suggests that because the amendment does not solve all instant problems in Church-State relationships it is inadequate, even dangerous. But where or when in the public life of any modern nation has one single legislative bill satisfied totally all the need in any major subject area? Must we refrain from solving some problems because we simply cannot solve all problems? In any case, here as elsewhere, a savings clause, can be affixed to the prayer amendment to prevent any conceivable overlap from it on existing practices. The point is, though, again here as before—where were those who now object to the Dirksen proposal for reasons of language during all the long months when men of integrity worked to find the best possible wording for a prayer amendment?

It has, often, been said that so-called "legislated prayer" is no good, that in fact it demeans religion. And this would, of course, be true were government to decree a specific religion and inflict sanction on those who refuse to follow an official liturgy. But is this at all the case with free, non-denominational prayer in a public classroom? The answer would be obvious if, once more, responsible men were not answering otherwise. Government, in our belief, exists to do for men collectively what they wish done and cannot accomplish even by pooling their single capacities. The principle of subsidiarity suggests that there are times when a larger unit of society must accomplish what a smaller unit cannot accomplish, but which the citizens of that society deem necessary for their communal existence. Quite naturally, then, public school parents turn to public school boards and public school superintendents to assure reverence in the class-room. Quite naturally, while in no way imposing or dictating, those boards and superintendants have taken perfectly normal action to accommodate the will of their constituents. This is by no means legislated prayer. Far from demeaning religion, this is a process entirely consonant with our democratic traditions and with the best wisdom over time of this reverent people. Said Vatican II in its "Decree on Education" (#7):

"The Church gives high praise to those civil authorities and civil societies that show regard for the pluralistic character of modern society and take into account the right of religious liberty, by helping families in such a way that in all schools the education of their children can be carried out according to the moral and religious convictions of each family."

Gentlemen, clearly the moral and religious convictions of the great majority of the nation's families include the right to free, non-denominational prayer in the public class-room. When government moves to recognize these convictions, it does a proper and right thing.

The Dirksen amendment, then, goes to the heart of the two principal purposes at stake here. It restores free, non-denominational prayer to the public school. It blocks any further erosion of public reverence. It does so, we believe, with adequate language, though, to satisfy the best need of the situation, we would accept the addition of a wise savings clause much as we did two years ago in our testimony in the House on the proposed Becker prayer amendment. The Dirksen amendment, let it be crystal clear, is restorative, clarifying of the First Amendment. The letter of the law, as the Court now spells it out, has gotten dangerously out of kilter with the spirit. We believe it is also out of kilter with the original letter. Far from attacking or rolling back the Bill of Rights, this Peoples amendment for Public Prayer will lift it back to its first common sense. It is not we who call for amendment who weaken the Constitution. It is those who, in a false reading of that Constitution, now oppose the united will of millions of Americans who demand that the Constitution as they have always understood it be preserved once and for all.

Gentlemen, it would seem that the task before you is now clear. The issue has been canvassed. The will of the nation has not changed. The generals without armies have not been able to convince even their own congregants. Your job, in all respects, is not to decide the continuing debate. Your job is not to return prayer and Bible reading to the public classroom; although I am sure I speak for the massive majority of Americans when I applaud these Senators and those Representatives who here, and earlier, have testified to the value of such prayer. Your job is to enoble a popular decision. Elected by the people and responsive to their conscience, your job is to put this question clearly and quickly to them for an ultimate judgment. If those who have come here dragging up the old red herrings of an attack on the Bill of Rights and minority rights are as confident of their logic as they seemed to be before you, why let them carry their case to the people, as we have done?

Gentlemen, once you complete your task, in fifty State capitals a splendid debate begins. Once again everywhere the nation must reflect on the role of God in its public life. We have no doubt whatsoever what the decision will be. In fifty States, the American people—while some of their so-called theologians quibble over whether God is dead and the city is secular, while some of their so-called religious leaders oppose—will re-affirm in one great voice that God lives, that the city is not secular, that religion must survive proudly central in our national heritage. "Religion," said the Roman Catholic hierarchy of these United States a few years ago, "is our chief national asset." Give them the chance, and the American people will repeat those words. Give them the chance and they will write again, as Boston wrote once in its proud motto—"Sicut patribus, sit Deus nobis." As God was with our fathers, so let Him be with us!

APPENDIX

One of the truly great books in prayer amendment literature is that authored by Rev. Joseph Costanzo, S.J., Professor of Historical Jurisprudence in the Fordham University Graduate School, New York City, and published as This Nation Under God by Herder and Herder, 1964. So that the Committee may have available to it some of the strong wisdom of these pages, we include the following excerpts as part of our testimony:

a. "The more the context of the New York prayer (struck down in the first prayer' decision) and the circumstances attending its option recitation are examined, the more can be discerned the vast possibilities it offered for the increase of friendly community life. First, the children and their approving parents of different faiths and church affiliations came together in a prayer based on the common bonds of the religious beliefs. Their religious sectarianism was in no way experienced as a barrier to the brotherhood of all men under the Fatherhood of God. . . . Secondly, it provided an opportune and excellent educational training and habituation to the exercise of individual choice in the midst of others according to the vaunted American boast of individualist and free self-expression. Religious differences are a very broad fact even for the most enlightened adults, and social adjustment in this matter is es-

sential to good community relations. Should not the youngsters mature gradually in this delicate experience with civility toward one another without resentment and without inhibition? The circumstances for the corporate prayer provided an early schooling for both the dissidents and the consentients to advance in mutual reverence for one another's religious choices. Thirdly, the dissenter and the minority must surely be shielded from majoritarian imposition. So too must the majority be protected from the unilateral dictation of the absolute dissenter. It is a strange pathology that when people in increasing numbers freely choose to act agreeably in unison there is less cause for public gratification than in the uncompromising protestations of the dissenter. . . . No one can deny that public law is burdened with an almost insurmountable task when it is confronted with the problems of religious pluralism. The voluntary nondenominational prayer was possibly one of the best and, at that, a minimal resolution of this thorny moral-legal problem," pages 132, 133.

b. "American believers are losing by default. They have taken their spiritual heritage for granted. They have allowed a creeping gradualism of secularism, under one specious pretext or another, to take over their public schools. A vociferous and highly organized pressure group is exerting its own form of indirect coercive pressure upon the American community. Determined to deflect American national traditions and heritage from their authentic historic course, this group is cutting a divisive swath across the nation, advertising for clients to challenge in court what is obnoxious to them. *Whoever works for the destruction of the positive doctrine of accommodation and mutual adjustment must shoulder the blame for uprooting the bonds of concord and friendship and for forcibly injecting bitter antagonisms into the nation's pluralistic society* (emphasis supplied)," pages 131, 132.

c. "These religious truths, fundamental because they are formally part of the Jewish, Protestant and Catholic faith, far from dividing have drawn our students together in silent prayer in public school exercises and in the salute of allegiance 'under God' to the flag. Oddly enough and contrary to their protestations, it is the separatists, neutralists and secularists who are truly divisive for they have raised issues that in the past have not troubled the students in public school exercises; and they have pointed loudly to the differences between the various faiths which students in their generosity keep to themselves. It is their bond which is vague and threateningly dangerous monism, a mechanical unitarism in a spiritual and intellectual vacuum . . . There is nothing divisive in the idea of brotherhood of men by divine creation, of fraternity by divine commandment of charity and justice binding in conscience. Far from being vague, these are definite religious truths which have bound our nation in peace and in war and have aroused our consciences against injustices in our midst as well as in other countries. A purely secular education is false to the nature of man and to God; false to American history; false to that philosophy of life and education which refuses to departmentalize what is inseparably one—the continuity of the spiritual life and moral development of the whole person, whether at home, at church or synagogue, or at school." Page 104.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13712) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966'.

"TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

"Tips

"SEC. 101. (a) Section 3(m) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In determining the wage of a tipped employee, the amount paid such employee by his employer shall be deemed to be increased on account of tips by an amount determined by the employer, but not by an amount in excess of 50 per centum of the applicable minimum wage rate, except that in the case of an employee who (either himself or acting through his representative) shows to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the actual amount of tips received by him was less than the amount determined by the employer as the amount by which the wage paid him was deemed to be increased under this sentence, the amount paid such employee by his employer shall be deemed to have been increased by such lesser amount.'

"(b) Section 3 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(t) "Tipped employee" means any employee engaged in an occupation in which he customarily and regularly receives more than $20 a month in tips.'

"Definition of enterprise

"SEC. 102. (a) Section 3(r) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'For purposes of this subsection, the activities performed by any person or persons—

"'(1) in connection with the operation of a hospital, an institution primarily engaged in the care of the sick, the aged, the mentally ill or defective who reside on the premises of such institution, a school for physically or mentally handicapped or gifted children, or an institution of higher education (regardless of whether or not such hospital, institution, or school is public or private or operated for profit or not for profit), or

"'(2) in connection with the operation of a street, suburban or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus carrier, if the rates and services of such railway or carrier are subject to regulation by a State or local agency (regardless of whether or not such railway or carrier is public or private or operated for profit or not for profit), shall be deemed to be activities performed for a business purpose.'

"(b) Section 3(d) of such Act is amended by inserting after 'of a State' the following: '(except with respect to employees of a State, or a political subdivision thereof, employed (1) in a hospital, institution, or school referred to in the last sentence of subsection (r) of this section, or (2) in the operation of a railway or carrier referred to in such sentence)'.

"(c) Section 3(s) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(s) "Enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce" means an enterprise which has employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, including employees handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person, and which—

"'(1) during the period February 1, 1967, through January 31, 1969, is an enterprise whose annual gross volume of sales made or business done is not less than $500,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated) or is a gasoline service establishment whose annual gross volume of sales is not less than $250,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated), and beginning February 1, 1969, is an enterprise whose annual gross volume of sales made or business done is not less than $250,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated);

"'(2) is engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothing or fabrics;

"'(3) is engaged in the business of construction or reconstruction, or both; or

"'(4) is engaged in the operation of a hospital, an institution primarily engaged in the care of the sick, the aged, the mentally ill or defective who reside on the premises of such institution, a school for physically or mentally handicapped or gifted children, or an institution of higher education (regardless of whether or not such hospital, institution, or school is public or private or operated for profit or not for profit).

Any establishment which has as its only regular employees the owner thereof or the parent, spouse, child, or other member of the immediate family of such owner shall not be considered to be an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or a part of such an enterprise, and the sales of such establishment shall not be included for the purpose of determining the annual gross volume of sales of any enterprise for the purpose of this subsection. In any case in which a person other than the owner of an apartment building is engaged by such owner to perform management services in connection with the operation of such building, any individual employed at, and resident in, such building as a manager, caretaker, or janitor, or in a similar capacity, shall be considered, for the purposes of this subsection, to be the employee of the owner of such building.'

"Agricultural employees

"SEC. 103. (a) Section 3(e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) "Employee" includes any individual employed by an employer, except that such term shall not, for the purposes of section 3(u), include—

"'(1) any individual employed by an employer engaged in agriculture if such individual is the parent, spouse, child, or other member of the employer's immediate family,

"'(2) any individual who is employed by an employer engaged in agriculture if such individual (A) is employed as a hand harvest laborer and is paid on a piece rate basis in an operation which has been, and is customarily and generally recognized as having been, paid on a piece rate basis in the region of employment, (B) commutes daily from his permament residence to the farm on which he is so employed, and (C) has been employed in agriculture less than thirteen weeks during the preceding calendar year, or

"'(3) any individual who is employed by an employer engaged in agriculture if such

individual is principally engaged in the range production of livestock.'

"(b) Section 3 of such Act is further amended by adding after subsection (t) (added by section 101(b) of this Act) the following new subsection:

"'(u) "Man-day" means any day during any portion of which an employee performs any agricultural labor."

"TITLE II—REVISION OF EXEMPTIONS

"Hotel, restaurant, and recreational establishments; hospitals and related institutions

"SEC. 201. (a) Section 13(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out everything preceding 'A "retail or service establishment"' and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(2) any employee employed by any retail or service establishment (except an establishment or employee engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothing or fabrics or an establishment engaged in the operation of a hospital, institution, or school described in section 3(s)(4)), if more than 50 per centum of such establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services is made within the State in which the establishment is located, and such establishment is not an enterprise described in section 3(s) or such establishment has an annual dollar volume of sales which is less than $250,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated).'

"(b)(1) Section 13(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (17), added by section 206(a)(2) of the Act, the following new paragraph:

"'(18) any employee employed by an establishment which is a hotel, motel, or restaurant; or is an institution (other than hospitals) primarily engaged in the care of the sick, the aged, the mentally ill, or defective who reside on the premises of such an institution; or'

"(2) Section 13(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph in lieu of the paragraph repealed by section 202 of this Act:

"'(3) any employee employed by an establishment which is an amusement or recreational establishment, if (A) it does not operate for more than seven months in any calendar year, or (B) during the preceding calendar year, its average receipts for any six months of such year were not more than 33⅓ per centum of its average receipts for the other six months of such year; or'.

"Laundry and cleaning establishments

"SEC. 202 Section 13(a)(3) of such Act is repealed.

"Agricultural employees

"SEC. 203 (a) Section 13(a)(6) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(6) any employee employed in agriculture (A) if such employee is employed by an employer who did not, during any calendar quarter during the preceding calendar year, use more than five hundred man-days of agricultural labor, (B) if such employee is the parent, spouse, child, or other member of his employer's immediate family, or (C) if such employee (i) is employed as a hand harvest laborer and is paid on a piece rate basis in an operation which has been, and is customarily and generally recognized as having been, paid on a piece rate basis in the region of employment, (ii) commutes daily from his permanent residence to the farm on which he is so employed, and (iii) has been employed in agriculture less than thirteen weeks during the preceding calendar year, or (D) if such employee (other than an employee described in clause (C) of this subsection) (i) is sixteen years of age or under and is employed as a hand harvest laborer, is paid on a piece-rate basis in an operation which has been, and is customarily and generally recognized as having been, paid on a piece-rate basis in the region of employment; (ii) is employed on the same farm as his parent or person standing in the place of his parent; and (iii) is paid at the same piece rate as employees over age sixteen are paid on the same farm; or (E) if such employee is principally engaged in the range production of livestock.'

"(b) Section 13(a)(16) of such Act (agricultural employees employed in livestock auctions) is repealed.

"(c) Section 13(b) of such Act is amended—

"(A) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting in lieu thereof '; or', and

"(B) by adding at the end of paragraph (11) the following new paragraphs:

"'(12) any employee employed in agriculture or in connection with the operation or maintenance of ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways, not owned or operated for profit, or operated on a share-crop basis, and which are used exclusively for supply and storing of water for agricultural purposes; or

"'(13) any employee with respect to his employment in agriculture by a farmer, notwithstanding other employment of such employee in connection with livestock auction operations in which such farmer is engaged as an adjunct to the raising of livestock, either on his own account or in conjunction with other farmers, if such employee (A) is primarily employed during his workweek in agriculture by such farmer, and (B) is paid for his employment in connection with such livestock auction operations at a wage rate not less than that prescribed by section 6(a)(1); or'.

"(d) Section 13(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(c)(1) The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply with respect to any employee employed in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he is so employed.

"'(2) No employee below the age of sixteen may be employed in agriculture in an occupation that the Secretary of Labor finds and declares to be particularly hazardous for the employment of children below age sixteen, except where such employee is employed by his parent or by a person standing in the place of his parent on a farm owned or operated by such parent or person.

"'(3) The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply to any child employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions, or in radio or television productions.'

"Agricultural processing employees

"SEC. 204. (a) Sections 13(a)(10) (employees engaged in handling and processing of agricultural, horticultural, and dairy products); 13(a)(17) (country elevator employees); 13(a)(18) (cotton ginning employees); and 13(a)(22) (fruit and vegetable transportation employees) of such Act are repealed.

"(b) Section 13(b) of such Act is amended by adding after paragraph (13) (added by section 203(c) of this Act) the following new paragraphs:

"'(14) any employee employed within the area of production (as defined by the Secretary) by an establishment commonly recognized as a country elevator, including such an establishment which sells products and services used in the operation of a farm, if no more than five employees are employed in the establishment in such operations; or

"'(15) any employee engaged in ginning of cotton for market, in any place of employment located in a county where cotton is grown in commercial quantities; or

"'(16) any employee engaged (A) in the transportation and preparation for transportation of fruits or vegetables, whether or not performed by the farmer, from the farm to a place of first processing or first marketing within the same State, or (B) in transportation, whether or not performed by the farmer, between the farm and any point within the same State of persons employed or to be employed in the harvesting of fruits or vegetables; or'.

"(c) Subsection (c) of section 7 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) For a period or periods of not more than ten workweeks in the aggregate in any calendar year, or fourteen workweeks in the aggregate in the case of an employer who does not qualify for the exemption in subsection (d) of this section any employer may employ any employee for a workweek in excess of that specified in subsection (a) without paying the compensation for overtime employment prescribed in such subsection if such employee (1) is employed by such employer in an industry found by the Secretary to be of a seasonal nature, and (2) receives compensation for employment by such employer in excess of ten hours in any workday, or for employment by such employer in excess of fifty-two hours in any workweek, as the case may be, at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.

"'(d) For a period or periods of not more than ten workweeks in the aggregate in any calendar year, or fourteen workweeks in the aggregate in the case of an employer who does not qualify for the exemption in subsection (c) of this section, any employer may employ any employee for a workweek in excess of that specified in subsection (a) without paying the compensation for overtime employment prescribed in such subsection, if such employee—

"'(1) is employed by such employer in an enterprise which is in an industry found by the Secretary—

"'(A) to be characterized by marked annually recurring seasonal peaks of operation at the places of first marketing or first processing of agricultural or horticultural commodities from farms if such industry is engaged in the handling, packing, preparing, storing, first processing, or canning of any perishable agricultural or horticultural commodities in their raw or natural state, or

"'(B) to be of a seasonal nature and engaged in the handling, packing, storing, preparing, first processing, or canning of any perishable agricultural or horticultural commodities in their raw or natural state, and

"'(2) receives compensation for employment by such employer in excess of ten hours in any workday, or for employment in excess of forty-eight hours in any workweek, as the case may be, at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.'

"(d)(1) Subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) of section 7 of such Act are redesignated as subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

"(2) Subsections (g) and (h) of such section 7 (as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection) are each amended by striking out 'subsection (d)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (e)'.

"Small newspapers

"SEC. 205. Section 13(a)(8) of such Act is amended by striking out 'where printed and published' and inserting in lieu thereof 'where published'.

"Transportation companies

"SEC. 206. (a) Section 13(a)(9) of such Act is repealed.

"(b)(1) Section 13(a)(12) of such Act is repealed.

"(2) Section 13(b) of such Act is amended by adding after paragraph (16) added by section 204(b) of this Act) the following new paragraph:

"'(17) any driver employed by an employer engaged in the business of operating taxicabs; or'.

"(c) Section 13(b)(7) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(7) any driver, operator, or conductor employed by an employer whose annual gross volume of sales made or business done is less than $1,000,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated), engaged in the business of operating a street, suburban or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus carrier, if the rates and services of such railway or carrier are subject to regulation by a State or local agency; or'

"Motion picture theater employees

"SEC. 207. Section 13(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph in lieu of the paragraph repealed by section 206(a) of this Act:

"'(9) any employee employed by an establishment which is a motion picture theater; or'.

"Logging crews

"SEC. 208. Section 13(a)(15) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(15) any employee employed in planting or tending trees, cruising, surveying, or felling timber, or in preparing or transporting logs or other forestry products to the mill, processing plant, railroad, or other transportation terminal, if the number of employees employed by his employer in such forestry or lumbering operations does not exceed eight during the year beginning February 1, 1967, and if the number of such employees does not exceed six beginning February 1, 1968, and thereafter.'

"Automobile, aircraft, and farm implement sales establishments

"SEC. 209. (a) Section 13(a)(19) of such Act is repealed.

"(b) Section 13(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph in lieu of the paragraph repealed by section 212 of this Act:

"'(10) any salesman (other than partsman) or mechanic primarily engaged in selling or servicing automobiles, trailers, trucks, farm implements or aircraft if employed by a nonmanufacturing establishment primarily engaged in the business of selling such vehicles to ultimate purchasers; or'

"Food service employees

"SEC. 210. (a) Section 13(a)(20) of such Act is repealed.

"(b) Section 13(b) of such Act is amended by adding after paragraph (18) (added by section 201(b)(1) of this Act) the following new pargraph:

"'(19) any employee of a retail or service establishment who is employed primarily in connection with the preparation or offering of food or beverages for human consumption either on the premises, or by such services as catering, banquet, box lunch, or curb or counter service, to the public, to employees, or to members or guests of members of clubs.'

"Gasoline service stations

"SEC. 211. Section 13(b)(8) of such Act is repealed.

"Petroleum distribution employees

"SEC. 212. (a) Section 13(b)(10) of such Act is repealed.

"(b) Section 7(b)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) by an independently owned and controlled local enterprise (including an enterprise with more than one bulk storage establishment) engaged in the wholesale or bulk distribution of petroleum products if—

"'(A) the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is less than $1,000,000 exclusive of excise taxes;

"'(B) more than 75 per centum of such enterprise's annual dollar volume of sales is made within the State in which such enterprise is located, and

"'(C) not more than 25 per centum of the annual dollar volume of sales of such enterprise is to customers who are engaged in the bulk distribution of such products for resale, and such employee receives compensation for employment in excess of forty hours in any workweek at a rate not less than one and one-half times the minimum wage rate applicable to him under section 6,'.

"Eniwetok and Kwajalein Atolls and Johnston Island

"SEC. 213. Section 13(f) of such Act is amended by striking out 'and the Canal Zone' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Eniwetok Atoll; Kwajalein Atoll; Johnston Island; and the Canal Zone'.

"Technical and conforming amendments

"SEC. 214. (a) Section 3(n) of such Act is amended by striking out ', except as used in subsection (s)(1),'.

"(b) Section 13(a) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by redesignating paragraphs (11), (13), (14), (15), and (21) as paragraphs (10), (11), (12), (13), and (14), respectively, and

"(2) by striking out '; or' at the end of paragraph (14) (as so redesignated in this subsection) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

"(c) Paragraph (7) of section 13(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'or order' and inserting in lieu thereof ', order, or certificate'.

"TITLE III—INCREASE IN MINIMUM WAGE

"Presently covered employees

"SEC. 301. (a) Section 6(a) of such Act is amended by amending that portion of the section preceding paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"'(a) Every employer shall pay to each of his employees who in any workweek is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, wages at the following rates:

"'(1) not less than $1.40 an hour during the first year from the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966 and not less than $1.60 an hour thereafter, except as otherwise provided in this section;'.

"(b) Such section is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a semicolon, and by adding the following new paragraph:

"'(4) if such employee is employed as a seaman on an American vessel, not less than the rate which will provide to the employee, for the period covered by the wage payment, wages equal to compensation at the hourly rate prescribed by paragraph (1) of this subsection for all hours during such period when he was actually on duty (including periods aboard ship when the employee was on watch or was, at the direction of a superior officer, performing work or standing by, but not including off-duty periods which are provided pursuant to the employment agreement); or'.

"Agricultural employees

"SEC. 302. Section 6(a) of such Act is amended by adding after paragraph (4) (added by section 301(b) of this Act) the following new paragraph:

"'(5) if such employee is employed in agriculture, not less than $1 an hour during the first year from the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966, not less than $1.15 an hour during the second year from such date, and not less than $1.30 an hour thereafter: *Provided,* That in the case of workers employed in agriculture in hand harvest work by an employer on a piece-rate basis, if during any workweek the average of the aggregated earnings of such workers exceeds the minimum hourly wage as prescribed above, the employer shall be considered to be in compliance with this section: *Provided further,* That no employee employed on such piece-rate basis is paid less than 75 per centum of the minimum wage applicable under this paragraph.'

"Newly covered employees

"SEC. 303. Section 6(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Every employer shall pay to each of his employees (other than an employee to whom subsection (a)(5) applies) who in any workweek is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and who in such workweek is brought within the purview of this section by the amendments made to this Act by the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966, wages at the following rates:

"'(1) not less than $1 an hour during the first year from the effective date of such amendments,

"'(2) not less than $1.15 an hour during the second year from such date,

"'(3) not less than $1.30 an hour during the third year from such date,

"'(4) not less than $1.45 an hour during the fourth year from such date, and

"'(5) not less than $1.60 an hour thereafter.'

"Employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands

"SEC. 304. Section 6(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(c)(1) The rate or rates provided by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be superseded in the case of any employee in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands only for so long as and insofar as such employee is covered by a wage order heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a special industry committee appointed pursuant to section 5.

"'(2) In the case of any such employee who is covered by such a wage order and to whom the rate or rates prescribed by subsection (a) would otherwise apply, the following rates shall apply:

"'(A) The rate or rates applicable under the most recent wage order issued by the Secretary prior to the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966, increased by 12 per centum, unless such rate or rates are superseded by the rate or rates prescribed in a wage order issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a review committee appointed under paragraph (C). Such rate or rates shall become effective sixty days after the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966 or one year from the effective date of the most recent wage order applicable to such employee theretofore issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a special industry committee appointed under section 5, whichever is later.

"'(B) Beginning one year after the applicable effective date under paragraph (A), not less than the rate of rates prescribed by paragraph (A), increased by an amount equal to 16 percentum of the rate or rates applicable under the most recent wage order issued by the Secretary prior to the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966, unless such rate or rates are superseded by the rate or rates prescribed in a wage order issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a review committee appointed under paragraph (C).

"'(C) Any employer, or group of employers, employing a majority of the employees in an industry in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, may apply to the Secretary in writing for the appointment of a review committee to recommend the minimum rate or rates to be paid such employees in lieu of the rate or rates provided by paragraph (A) or (B). Any such application with respect

to any rate or rates provided for under paragraph (A) shall be filed within sixty days following the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966 and any such application with respect to any rate or rates provided for under paragraph (B) shall be filed not more than one hundred and twenty days and not less than sixty days prior to the effective date of the applicable rate or rates under paragraph (B). The Secretary shall promptly consider such application and may appoint a review committee if he has reasonable cause to believe, on the basis of financial and other information contained in the application, that compliance with any applicable rate or rates prescribed by paragraph (A) or (B) will substantially curtail employment in such industry. The Secretary's decision upon any such application shall be final. Any wage order issued pursuant to the recommendations of a review committee appointed under this paragraph shall take effect on the applicable effective date provided in paragraph (A) or (B).

"'(D) In the event a wage order has not been issued pursuant to the recommendation of a review committee prior to the applicable effective date under paragraph (A) or (B), the applicable percentage increase provided by any such paragraph shall take effect on the effective date prescribed therein, except with respect to the employees of an employer who filed an application under paragraph (C) and who files with the Secretary an undertaking with a surety or sureties satisfactory to the Secretary for payment to his employees of an amount sufficient to compensate such employees for the difference between the wages they actually receive and the wages to which they are entitled under this subsection. The Secretary shall be empowered to enforce such undertaking and any sums recovered by him shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the employee or employees affected. Any such sum not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of three years shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"'(3) In the case of any such employee to whom subsection (a)(5) or subsection (b) would otherwise apply, the Secretary shall within sixty days after the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966 appoint a special industry committee in accordance with section 5 to recommend the highest minimum wage rate or rates in accordance with the standards prescribed by section 8, but not in excess of the applicable rate provided by subsection (a) (5) or subsection (b), to be applicable to such employee in lieu of the rate or rates prescribed by subsection (a)(5) or subsection (b), as the case may be. The rate or rates recommended by the special industry committee shall be effective with respect to such employee upon the effective date of the wage order issued pursuant to such recommendation but not before sixty days after the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966.

"'(4) The provisions of section 5 and section 8, relating to special industry committees, shall be applicable to review committees appointed under this subsection. The appointment of a review committee shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any special industry committee required to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 8, except that no special industry committee shall hold any hearing within one year after a minimum wage rate or rates for such industry shall have been recommended to the Secretary by a review committee to be paid in lieu of the rate or rates provided for under paragraph (A) or (B). The minimum wage rate or rates prescribed by this subsection shall be in effect only for so long as and insofar as such minimum wage rate or rates have not been superseded by a wage order fixing a higher minimum wage rate or rates (but not in excess of the applicable rate prescribed in subsection (a) or subsection (b)) hereafter issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendation of a special industry committee.'

"Contract services to Federal Government

"SEC. 305. Section 6 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 of this Act (except subsections (a)(1) and (f) thereof), every employer providing services under a contract subject to section 2(b)(1) of the Service Contract Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1034) or any subcontract thereunder shall pay to each of his employees whose rate of pay is not governed by the Service Contract Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-286) or to whom subsection (a)(1) of this section is not applicable, wages at rates not less than the rates provided for in subsection (b) of this section.'

"Federal employees

"SEC. 306. Section 18 of such Act is amended by inserting '(a)' immediately after 'SEC. 18.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (other than section 13(f)) or any other law, any employee—

"'(1) described in paragraph (7) of section 202 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1082(7)) whose compensation is required to be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates, and any Federal employee in the Canal Zone engaged in employment of the kind described in such paragraph (7), or

"'(2) described in section 7474 of title 10, United States Code, whose rates of wages are established to conform, as nearly as is consistent with the public interest, with those of private establishments in the immediate vicinity, or

"'(3) employed in a nonappropriated fund instrumentality under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces,

shall have his basic compensation fixed or adjusted at a wage rate which is not less than the appropriate wage rate provided for in section 6(a)(1) of this Act (except that the wage rate provided for in section 6(b) shall apply to any employee who performed services during the workweek in a work place within the Canal Zone), and shall have his overtime compensation set at an hourly rate not less than the overtime rate provided for in section 7(a) of this Act.'

"TITLE IV—APPLICATION OF MAXIMUM HOURS PROVISIONS

"Presently and newly covered employees

"SEC. 401. Section 7(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a)(1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, no employer shall employ any of his employees who in any workweek is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, for a workweek longer than forty hours unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.

"'(2) No employer shall employ any of his employees who in any workweek is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and who in such workweek is brought within the purview of this subsection by the amendments made to this Act by the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966—

"'(A) for a workweek longer than forty-four hours during the first year from the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966,

"'(B) for a workweek longer than forty-two hours during the second year from such date, or

"'(C) for a workweek longer than forty hours after the expiration of the second year from such date,

unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.'

"Commission salesman

"SEC. 402. Subsection (i) of section 7 of such Act (as so redesignated by section 204 (d) of this Act) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In determining the proportion of compensation representing commissions, all earnings resulting from the application of a bona fide commission rate shall be deemed commissions on goods or services without regard to whether the computed commissions exceed the draw or guarantee.'

"SEC. 403. Section 7 of such Act is amended to include the following new subsection:

"'(j) No employer engaged in the operation of a hospital shall be deemed to have violated subsection (a) if, pursuant to an agreement or understanding arrived at between the employer and the employee before performance of the work, a work period of fourteen consecutive workdays is accepted in lieu of the workweek of seven consecutive workdays for purposes of overtime computation and if, for his employment in excess of eight hours in any workday and in excess of eighty hours in such fourteen-day period, the employee receives compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.'

"TITLE V—HANDICAPPED WORKERS

"SEC. 501. Section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'SEC. 14.' and by amending clause (2) of subsection (a) to read as follows: '(2) subject to the special provisions in subsections "(b)" and "(c)", the employment of individuals whose earning capacity is impaired by age, or physical or mental deficiency or injury, under special certificates issued by the Secretary, at such wages lower than the minimum wage applicable under section 6 and for such period as shall be fixed in such certificates.'

"SEC. 502. Section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is further amended by adding the following new subsections at the end of subsection (a):

"'(b) Handicapped workers employed in sheltered workshops shall be paid wages commensurate with those paid nonhandicapped workers in industry in the vicinity for essentially the same type, quantity, and quality of work, but not less than the wages specified in the special certificates issued under clause (2) of subsection (a), subject to the provisions of this subsection and subsection (c): *Provided,* That effective January 1, 1967, no certificate shall be issued under clause (2) of subsection (a) which shall permit the payment to handicapped workers employed in sheltered workshops of wages at a rate lower than 50 per centum of the minimum wage applicable under section 6 of this Act; beginning January 1, 1968, such wages shall not be less than 75 per centum of such minimum wage; and beginning January 1, 1969, such wages shall not be less than the minimum wage in effect under section 6 of this Act; but in no instance shall handicapped workers employed in sheltered workshops receiving wages in excess of the prescribed minimums be reduced to the prescribed minimums.

" 'The Secretary, pursuant to regulations which he shall prescribe, may issue special certificates for less than the minimum wage requirements under this subsection in proportion to the worker's productivity:

" '(1) In the case of handicapped workers engaged in training or evaluation programs, where their work is incidental to such programs, and such regulations shall specify time limitations and other criteria which shall be conditions for the issuance of such special certificates; and

" '(2) Under exceptional circumstances, and such regulations shall specify and describe the term "exceptional circumstances" which shall include multihandicapped individuals and those individuals so severely impaired that they are unable to engage in competitive employment.

" 'The State agency administering or supervising the administration of vocational rehabilitation services shall certify to the Secretary those handicapped individuals for whom special certificates may be issued under (1) and (2) above, and said certifications shall be reviewed annually by the Secretary.

" '(c) The Secretary shall establish a new classification which shall be called work activity centers, and which shall be distinguished from the sheltered workshops covered by subsections (a) and (b) of this section in that said centers shall be planned and designed exclusively for handicapped workers whose physical or mental impairment is so severe as to make their productive capacity inconsequential.

" 'The Secretary is directed to conduct a study by January 1, 1968, to establish a formula for determining equitable compensation for handicapped workers employed in work activity centers.

" 'Only handicapped workers whose productive capacity has been evaluated and certified to the Secretary as inconsequential by the State agency administering or supervising the administration of vocational rehabilitation services shall be employed in a work activity center, and such certifications shall be reviewed annually by the Secretary.

" 'Pending the development of such formula, the Secretary is directed to approve special certificates for less than the minimums applicable under section 6, or subsections (a) and (b) of this section.'

"SEC. 503. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administration of the provisions of this Act by the Secretary of Labor and by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"SEC. 504. The Secretary of Labor is hereby instructed to commence immediately a complete study of wage payments to handicapped clients of sheltered workshops and of the feasibility of raising existing wage standards in such workshops. The Secretary is further instructed to report to the Congress by July 1, 1967, the findings of such study with appropriate recommendations.

"TITLE VI—STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS; EFFECTIVE DATE; AND STUDY

"Statute of limitations

"SEC. 601. (a) Section 16(c) of such Act is amended by striking out 'two-year statute' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'statutes'.

"(b) Section 6(a) of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 (Public Law 49, Eightieth Congress) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ', except that a cause of action arising out of a willful violation may be commenced within three years after the cause of action accrued'.

"Effective date

"SEC. 602. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on February 1, 1967. On and after the date of the enactment of this Act the Secretary is authorized to promulgate necessary rules, regulations, or orders with regard to the amendments made by this Act.

"Study of excessive overtime

"SEC. 603. The Secretary of Labor is hereby instructed to commence immediately a complete study of present practices dealing with overtime payments for work in excess of forty hours per week and the extent to which such overtime work impedes the creation of new job opportunities in American industry. The Secretary is further instructed to report to the Congress by July 1, 1967, the findings of such survey with appropriate recommendations.

"TITLE VII—INCREASE IN WITNESS FEES

"SEC. 701. The first sentence of section 1821, title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: 'A witness attending in any court of the United States, or before a United States commissioner, or before any person authorized to take his deposition pursuant to any rule or order of a court of the United States, at any time shall receive for each hour or fraction of an hour of such attendance, and for each hour or fraction of an hour necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the same, compensation at a rate equal to the minimum hourly wage rate prescribed at such time by section 6 (a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, but not less than $4 per day for each day of such attendance or travel, and shall receive 8 cents per mile for going from and returning to his place of residence.'

"SEC. 702. The amendment made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the third month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN STAFF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO HAVE THE PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional staff members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted on the floor during the consideration of the pending bill, H.R. 13712.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we turn at this time to a consideration of H.R. 13712, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees and to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, at the present time 29.6 million workers in America, out of the total of 60 million in our industrial work force, are covered by Federal minimum wage laws. This bill would raise the minimum standards of those 29.6 million covered by the present minimum wage laws, and it would bring under the minimum wage laws for the first time—and set a floor below which their wages could not go—7.2 million workers.

This is landmark legislation, not merely in labor, but also in the economy of America. The legislation we are considering today is perhaps the most important domestic legislation to come before this Congress. It raises some fundamental questions concerning the responsibility of a democratic government to its people—all its people and not only those who are influential enough or articulate enough to make their voices heard in the Halls of Congress.

This Congress has sought to improve the quality of our educational system, to stimulate economic growth, to guarantee all citizens their full constitutional rights. These are sound objectives; their attainment are goals worthy of a great nation.

But, of what value are constitutional rights to those who lack basic economic rights?

Of what use are improved schools to those whose economic deprivation destroys their self-respect and motivation to improve their condition?

What good is general prosperity to those who are not permitted to share in its benefits?

As President Roosevelt stated in 1937:

> Our Nation, so richly endowed with natural resources and with a capable and industrious population should be able to devise ways and means of insuring to all our able-bodied working men and women a fair day's pay for a fair day's work.

The proposed legislation would provide a minimum wage for newly covered nonfarm workers of $1 an hour beginning February 1, 1967. This minimum rate will be raised in four annual increases to $1.60 an hour beginning February 1, 1971.

For workers now covered by the act, the minimum wage would be raised from $1.25 to $1.40 per hour, beginning February 1, 1967, and, under the amendment adopted in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to $1.60 an hour 1 year later, February 1, 1968. That, Mr. President, would be for the 29.6 million now covered by minimum wages.

Farmworkers, unless exempted, would be provided a minimum wage of $1 an hour, to be raised in two annual increases to $1.30 an hour beginning February 1, 1969.

The increase in the minimum wage is essential to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for the health and general well-being of the Nation's workers. An individual who works 40 hours per week at the present statutory minimum earns $2,600 in 1 year.

That in itself is below the minimum income of $3,000 judged to be poverty-level income in this country today. The present $1.25 or $2,600 a year is totally out of line with the realities of today.

Would any Member of this Chamber seriously contend that $2,600 for a year of work represents a fair labor standard?

There are those who will say that an increase in the statutory minimum or an extension of coverage to new classes of employees is inflationary; that it will result in layoffs; or that we simply just cannot afford it. These same persons throw up their arms in horror because the $1.60 minimum rate for presently covered workers will take place in 1968 instead of some later date. A living wage, they claim, is just too much for some employers to pay.

I point out that the minimum wage has to go to $1.60 in order to get the workers above a yearly income of $3,000.

These same, stale arguments are raised in one form or another every time fair labor standards are considered. This Nation has survived and indeed prospered as a result of improvements in basic living standards in the past. The minimum wage laws had much to do with that. I am inclined to believe that our ability to do so now has not been impaired by over 5 years of uninterrupted economic growth. The truth is, of course, that this legislation can and will improve the income, level of living, morale, and efficiency of many of our lowest paid workers and encourages more effective use of manpower in our economy. When it comes to standards of elementary decency for large numbers of Americans, this Nation can ill afford to plead poverty.

If this Nation contends that it cannot pay a level of wages high enough to bring a family above the poverty level, then the Nation pleads poverty in that case. So this bill is an answer to the plea that the Nation is poverty stricken and cannot pay the minimum wage to bring workers up to a wage which is above the poverty bracket.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers shares my view—and the view of the committee—that the economy can readily adjust to the proposed minimum rate increases. In a letter of May 19, 1966, to the House leadership, the Council made the following statement concerning the bill and the effect it will have on the economy:

> The minimum wage increase proposed by H.R. 13712 for those already covered by the FLSA reflects appropriate concern for the standards of noninflationary behavior of wages.

Mr. President, I wish to stress those words: This is noninflationary.

> As you know, the Council's wage guidepost provides for a specific exception in those cases "where wages are particularly low—that is, near the bottom of the economy's wage scales." The wages of those actually affected by minimum wage protection obviously fall into this category of exceptions to the guidepost, and therefore should move up at a more rapid pace than the economy's productivity trend. Only then can our least advantaged workers move closer to the average standards of prosperity enjoyed by the Nation's labor force. When one considers the time span since the last increase in the minimum wage in 1963 and the timing of the increases scheduled by H.R. 13712, the rate of increase appears entirely reasonable for this particular type of exception to the guideposts.

In addition to raising the minimum wage the proposed legislation would extend protections of the Fair Labor Standards Act to more than 7 million employees not now covered by any law protecting them on minimum wages. Included are workers in retailing, construction workers, laundry and drycleaning, transit, restaurant, and food service workers; employees engaged in agriculture, agricultural processing, and logging; employees of hotels, motels, hospitals, and related institutions. It would also incorporate basic wage policies for Federal wage board employees, certain employees of naval facilities whose wages are established to conform with those of private establishments in the vicinity where they work, and employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities. The wages of these Federal employees are now dependent in part on administrative discretion.

Many of the employees who would be covered by the new legislation are among the most poorly paid and economically deprived in our society. In studying this legislation, our committee found that there was a significant correlation between poverty earnings and exclusion from the protective provisions of the act. Among family heads employed in industries generally covered by the act, only 5 to 10 percent had annual incomes under $3,000 in 1964. The figure is 6 to 13 percent in industries where there is partial coverage. But in industries where there is little or no coverage, the proportions jumped to 29 and 47 percent, respectively.

(At this point Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have been discussing this matter from the point of view of the individual worker who is now receiving a poverty wage. But, it is also clear that the Nation as a whole loses when the sores of poverty are permitted to fester. We talk about crime, and violence in the streets, and juvenile delinquency, and dope addiction. We spend millions of dollars on police protection and then complain that what what we are doing is inadequate. It is proposed that we spend tens of billions of dollars doing something about poverty in the cities. It is inadequate, and it will continue to be inadequate as long as large groups in our society are unable to receive an honest day's pay for an honest day's work.

We have learned that we have in this Nation workers receiving 25, 40, 50, 60, and 65 cents an hour who should be under the minimum wage law of at least $1 an hour under any society standard.

The legislation which we are considering today is a necessary step in remedying inadequacies of our present approach. I strongly urge favorable consideration of this important bill, the provisions of which I should now like to explain in detail.

1. ENTERPRISE COVERAGE

Before the 1961 amendments to the act, coverage was limited to individual employees who were themselves engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. The 1961 amendments expanded coverage by adding protection for those employed in an "enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce." However, the enterprise coverage was subject to an annual sales test of $1 million. Separate dollar tests for the construction industry—$350,000—and gasoline service establishments—$250,000 were provided.

Section 3(a) of the present bill would reduce the million-dollar test to $500,000 for 2 years, and then reduce it again to $250,000 as the test, after 2 years. There would be no dollar tests for enterprises engaged in: first, laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothing or fabrics; second, construction; or, third, the operation of hospitals and related institutions and institutions of higher education.

"Mom and Pop" stores—those establishments in which the only employees are the immediate family of the owner—continue to be excluded, and their sales are not to be used in determining the annual gross sales of any "enterprise."

2. TIPS

Section 3(m), defining the term "wage," is amended by adding to the section a provision that the wages paid by an employer to a "tipped employee" are to include tips. There is a limitation that tips cannot exceed 50 percent of the applicable minimum wage. In other words, an employer cannot rely on tips alone. A "tipped employee" is defined in section 3(t) as any employee engaged in an occupation in which he customarily and regularly receives more than $20 a month in tips.

The amendment establishes certainty in the law where it has been lacking. Perhaps more importantly, it takes cognizance of the expansion of coverage into areas where the employment of tipped employees is common.

As to the mechanics of the provision, the bill permits the employer to make an initial determination of the amount of tips, and thus avoids any interference in normal payroll practices. However, it affords safeguards to the employee by permitting him to show, if he can, to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that the actual amount of tips received by him was less than the amount of tips determined by his employer and having his wage adjusted by the difference.

3. REVISION OF EXEMPTIONS

First. Hotels, motels, restaurants, seasonal amusement and recreational establishments, and hospitals and related institutions: The bill repeals the minimum wage and overtime exemptions now provided in section 13(a)(2)(ii) and (iii) for hotels, motels, restaurants, and hospitals and related institutions, but restores the overtime exemption for hotels, motels, restaurants, and nursing homes in a new section 13(b)(8).

As amended, the exemption in section 13(a)(2) would be limited to any retail or service establishment: First, having more than 50 percent of its annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services being made within the State wherein it is located; and, second, not within an enterprise described in section 3(s), or having an annual dollar volume of sales which is less than $250,000. The defi-

nition of a "retail or service establishment" in section 13(a)(2) remains unchanged. It is defined as an establishment 75 percent of whose annual dollar volume of sales of goods, services, or both is not for resale and is recognized as retail sales or services in the particular industry.

Expressly carved out from the exemption are establishments or employees engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothing or fabrics or establishments engaged "in the operation of" hospitals and related institutions and institutions of higher education which are within the new "enterprise" coverage.

The minimum wage and overtime exemption contained in section 13(a)(20) for any employee of a retail or service establishment who is employed primarily in connection with the preparation or offering of food or beverages for human consumption is repealed. But the overtime exemption is retained in a new section 13(b)(18).

The minimum wage and overtime exemption in section 13(a)(2)(ii) for seasonal amusement and recreational establishments is limited to establishments which do not operate for more than 7 months annually, of which have average receipts for any 6 months of the year which do not exceed one-third of their average receipts for the remaining 6 months of the year.

Second. Laundry and cleaning establishments: The minimum wage and overtime exemption of any employee employed by any establishment engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothing or fabrics—section 13(a)(3)—is eliminated.

Third. Agricultural workers: The bill covers only agricultural workers on the largest farms—the so-called agri-business enterprises—which used 500 man-days of agricultural labor in any calendar quarter of the preceding year.

A "man-day" is defined in a new section 3(u) as meaning any day during any portion of which an employee performs any agricultural labor.

Certain employees are to be excluded from both the general man-day count and from the coverage of the act. These employees are not included in determining whether an individual farm exceeds the 500 man-day criteria, and are not covered even though employed by a farm which does meet the criteria. The employees who are so excluded are:

First. The parent, spouse, child, or other member of an agricultural employer's immediate family;

Second. An employee who (a) is employed as a hand harvest laborer and is paid on a piece-rate basis in an operation which has been, and is customarily and generally recognized as having been, paid on a piece-rate basis in the region of employment, (b) commutes daily from his permanent residence to the farm on which he is so employed, and (c) has been employed in agriculture less than 13 weeks during the preceding calendar year; and

Third. An employee who is "principally engaged in the range production of livestock."

The bill also provides an exemption for the children of migrant workers if such children are (a) 16 years of age or under and are employed as hand harvest laborers, (b) paid on a piece-rate basis in an operation which has been, and is customarily and generally recognized as having been, paid on a piece-rate basis in the region of employment, (c) employed on the same farm as their parents, and (d) paid the same piece rate as employees over age 16 are paid on the same farm.

Although the employment of these children is exempt from the minimum wage requirements, such employment will be included in the 500 man-day count.

The bill removes the present minimum wage exemption in section 13(a)(16) for agricultural employees employed in livestock auction operations.

Exemption from the overtime requirements of the act would be preserved for any employee employed: First, in agriculture, or in connection with the operation or maintenance of ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways for agricultural purposes; and, second, in connection with livestock auction operations—new sections 13(b) (12) and (13), respectively.

Fourth. Agricultural handling and processing: The bill revises the exemptions relating to agricultural handling and processing contained in section 13(a) and section 7 of the act.

The exemptions in section 13(a) for the following employees have been replaced by new overtime exemptions in section 13(b): First, employees employed by country elevators; second, employees employed in the ginning of cotton; and, third, employees engaged in the transportation of fruit and vegetables or the transportation of farmworkers.

The present exemption in section 13 (a)(10) of the act provides a complete year-round exemption from the act's minimum wage and overtime provisions for employees in the area of production and engaged in, first, handling, preparing, storing, compressing, pasteurizing, drying, and preparing agricultural or horticultural commodities in their raw or natural state; second, canning agricultural or horticultural commodities for market; or, third, making dairy products.

This minimum wage and overtime exemption is repealed by the bill.

There is presently in section 7(b)(3) a 14-week overtime exemption, limited to 12 hours a day and 56 hours a week, applicable to employees employed in seasonal industries.

The present overtime exemption in section 7(c) of the act may be summarized as follows:

First. There is a year-round unlimited exemption applicable to employees of employers engaged in (a) first processing of milk, et cetera, into dairy products; (b) cotton compressing and ginning; (c) cottonseed processing; or, (d) the processing of certain farm products into sugar.

Second. There is a 14-week unlimited exemption applicable to employees of employers engaged in (a) first processing, et cetera, of perishable or seasonal fresh fruits or vegetables; (b) first processing within area of production of any agricultural commodity during a seasonal operation; or, (c) handling or slaughtering of livestock and poultry.

These two exemptions are replaced by exemptions contained in new sections 7 (c) and 7(d). Section 7(c) provides a 14-week overtime exemption for employees employed in a seasonal industry, limited to 10 hours a day and 52 hours a week.

The new section 7(d) provides a 14-week overtime exemption, limited to 10 hours a day and 48 hours a week, for employees in an enterprise which is in an industry found by the Secretary of Labor to be, first, engaged in handling, processing, and so forth, of perishable agricultural or horticultural commodities in their raw or natural state; and, second, seasonal in nature or characterized by marked annually recurring seasonal peaks of operation at the places of first marketing or first processing of such commodities from farms.

"Perishable agricultural or horticultural commodities" are those which in their raw or natural state are subject to deterioration or spoilage under ordinary circumstances unless some affirmative action is taken within a short time to preserve them from spoilage or decay.

A "seasonal industry" is one which stops its primary operations during those parts of the year when, as a result of natural conditions, the commodities handled in such industry are not available. On the other hand, an industry characterized by "seasonal peaks" of operation does not stop its primary operations during the year, but, rather, maintains them at a constant level except during certain periods of the year when its operations are greatly expanded to take care of the seasonal influx of the commodities in their raw or natural state.

If an employer qualifies for an exemption under both section 7(c) and 7(d), each exemption is limited to 10 weeks, making 20 weeks the maximum aggregate period of exemption available to an employer under these sections.

Fifth. Small newspapers: Section 13 (a)(8) of the act presently provides a minimum wage and overtime exemption for employees of certain small newspapers if the major part of the newspaper's circulation is within the county in which it is both printed and published, or contiguous counties. This section is amended so that the major part of the newspaper's circulation need only be in the county in which the newspaper is published, or contiguous counties.

Sixth. Transportation companies: The minimum wage and overtime exemption for employees of street, suburban or interurban electric railways, or local trolley or motor bus carriers in section 13(a)(9) is amended by repealing the present exemption and by providing an overtime exemption for operating employees if the employer has annual sales of less than $1 million.

The minimum wage and overtime exemption for employers in the taxicab business in section 13(a)(12) is narrowed to an overtime exemption for taxi drivers in section 13(b)(17).

Seventh. Logging crews: The present minimum wage and overtime exemption for logging crews of 12 or less is amended to exempt crews of 8 or less during the year beginning February 1, 1967, and crews of 6 or less beginning February 1, 1968 and thereafter.

Eighth. Automobile, aircraft, and farm implement sales establishments: Section 13(a)(19), exempting any employee of establishments engaged primarily in selling automobiles, trucks, or farm implements from the act's minimum wage and overtime requirements is repealed, and an overtime exemption is provided for salesmen and mechanics employed by nonmanufacturing establishments engaged primarily in selling automobiles, trucks, trailers, farm implements, or aircraft to ultimate purchasers.

Ninth. Gasoline service stations: The overtime exemption for employees of gasoline service stations in section 13(b)(8) is repealed.

Tenth. Petroleum distribution employees: The unlimited overtime exemption of petroleum distribution employees of the type described in section 13(b)(10) is modified in an amendment of section 7(b)(3) by requiring the payment of time and one-half the applicable minimum wage for hours worked in excess of 40 in any workweek. Also, if such employees work in excess of 12 hours in any workday or 56 hours in any workweek, they must be paid at a rate not less than 1½ times their "regular" rates of pay.

Mr. President, we have been speaking primarily of newly covered employees. We now come to presently covered workers, numbering 29 million.

4. INCREASES IN MINIMUM WAGE

First. Presently covered employees: Employees now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act would be entitled to a minimum wage of not less than $1.40 an hour beginning February 1, 1967, and not less than $1.60 an hour beginning February 1, 1968.

Second. Agricultural employees: The minimum wage for newly covered agricultural employees would be not less than $1 beginning February 1, 1967; $1.15 an hour beginning February 1, 1968; and $1.30 an hour beginning February 1, 1969.

Thus, the minimum wage coverage for agricultural employees goes up to $1.30 an hour and stops there under this bill.

The bill also provides that the employer of hand harvest workers paid on a piece rate basis shall be considered in compliance with the minimum wage requirements if the average earnings of his piece rate workers in a workweek exceed the minimum hourly wage. However, this provision requires that every worker be paid at least 75 percent of the applicable minimum wage.

Third. Newly covered employees: Employees newly covered by the act, except agricultural employees, would be entitled to a minimum wage of not less than $1 an hour beginning February 1, 1967; and, through annual increases, to $1.15 an hour, $1.30 an hour, $1.45 an hour, to the $1.60 an hour over a 4-year period. Thus by February 1, 1971, all nonagricultural employees subject to the act would be receiving a minimum wage of at least $1.60 an hour—bringing them to the same minimum wage as those presently covered by the minimum wage law by February 1, 1971.

5. EMPLOYEES IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A two-step increase in existing wage order rates would be provided in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands—12 percent the first year and 16 percent 1 year later. The review committee procedures provided in the 1961 amendments to the act are retained to assure that the increase in minimum wage orders will not adversely affect employment.

The minimum wages of employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands covered by the act for the first time would be established by special industry committees subject to the usual standard of reaching "as rapidly as is economically feasible without substantially curtailing employment the objective of the minimum wage prescribed" for the employees involved.

6. CONTRACT SERVICES FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Under the bill every employer providing a contract service under a Federal contract or subcontract to section 2(b)(1) of the McNamara-O'Hara Service Contract Act of 1965 must pay his employees not less than the applicable minimum wage applicable to newly covered workers. This provision does not apply with respect to "white collar" workers. Also employees whose rate of pay is governed by the Service Contract Act, or employees now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, would be exempt from this provision in order to safeguard existing wage standards.

7. FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The bill would incorporate in a new section 18(b) of the act the policy of paying minimum wages and overtime pay as required by the act to certain Federal wage board employees, employees of naval facilities whose wages are established to conform with those in the immediate vicinity, and to employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces. The provision contemplates the continuance of existing administrative procedures relating to the payment of these workers. But it removes from the realm of administrative discretion the ultimate minimum wage floor.

Mr. President, the question has often come up as to what we mean by nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces. There are many examples. One common one is the PX. The armed services PX's are not under appropriated funds, and their employees will now be covered.

The minimum wage applicable to these Federal employees will be the section 6(a)(1) rate—that is, the rate for presently covered workers—except in the Canal Zone. We have made an exception, Mr. President, in the Panama Canal Zone, where the minimum wage schedule for newly covered workers will apply.

8. APPLICATION OF MAXIMUM HOURS PROVISION

First. Presently and newly covered employees: The bill would retain the basic concept of time and one-half for hours worked in excess of 40 in a workweek. However, there are three-step adjustments to this standard in the case of nonfarm employees to be covered by the act by virtue of the bill. For these employees, the maximum workweek would be 44 hours during the year commencing February 1, 1967; 42 hours during the year beginning February 1, 1968; and 40 hours after February 1, 1969.

Second. Commission salesmen: The bill provides that in determining the proportion of compensation representing commissions for purposes of the overtime exemption in the present section 7(h) of the act, all earnings resulting from the application of a bona fide commission rate shall be deemed commissions without regard to whether they exceed a draw or guarantee.

Third. Hospital employees: This is a newly covered group, Mr. President.

The bill permits hospitals to calculate their overtime on a biweekly rather than weekly basis, provided that employees are paid time and one-half their regular rates of pay for workdays in excess of 8 hours and for hours worked over 80 in a 14-day work period. This basis of computing overtime may be used only where the employees of the hospital have reached an understanding with their employer that the work period is to be a period of 14 consecutive days.

9. ENIWETOK AND KWAJALEIN ATOLLS AND JOHNSTON ISLAND

An amendment of section 13(f) of the act makes its provisions applicable to employees in Johnston Island and in the Eniwetok and Kwajalein Atolls in the Pacific.

10. HANDICAPPED WORKERS

At the present time section 14 of the act allows the Secretary of Labor, to the extent necessary in order to prevent curtailment of opportunities for employment, to permit the employment of handicapped workers at wages lower than the applicable minimum wage. The bill adds two new subsections to section 14 relating to the employment of handicapped workers in sheltered workshops and the establishment of work activity centers.

The bill provides that handicapped workers employed in sheltered workshops must be paid wages commensurate with those paid nonhandicapped workers for essentially the same kind of work, but not less than 50 percent of the applicable minimum wage during 1967, 75 percent of such minimum wage during 1968, and 100 percent of such minimum wage thereafter. However, special certificates may be issued by the Secretary for less than the minimum wage in proportion to the worker's productivity where the work is incidental to a training or evaluation program, or under exceptional circumstances where handicaps prevent an individual from engaging in competitive employment.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary to establish special rates of compensation for handicapped workers employed in "work activity centers." A "work activity center," as this term is used in the bill, means an establishment designed exclusively for workers whose physical or

mental handicap is so severe as to make their productive capacity inconsequential.

The Secretary is directed to conduct a study by January 1, 1968, to establish an equitable means for setting the wages of workers in work activity centers. He is also directed to conduct a study by July 1, 1967, of wage payments to employees of sheltered workshops and the feasibility of raising wage standards in such workshops.

11. CHILD LABOR IN AGRICULTURE

The bill would prohibit the employment of any child below the age of 16 in an occupation in agriculture found by the Secretary of Labor to be particularly hazardous.

The accident rate in agriculture is exceeded only in the mining and construction industries, a fact which clearly underscores the need for according safety and health protections to children in agriculture.

12. STUDY OF EXCESSIVE OVERTIME

The bill directs the Secretary of Labor to begin immediately a complete study of present practices dealing with overtime payments for work in excess of 40 hours per week and the extent to which such overtime work impedes the creation of new job opportunities. The Secretary is to report his findings and recommendations to the Congress by July 1, 1967.

13. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Section 601 of the bill amends the FLSA and the Portal Act—which contains the statute of limitations for the FLSA—to provide a 3-year—rather than a 2-year—statute of limitations for causes of action arising out of a willful violation of this law.

In closing, the bill represents an effort to fulfill the promise of the original act and to reestablish its role as the major instrument of the Nation's fair labor standards policies. It reflects a reexamination of current needs to remove substandard working conditions and an effort to change the act to remedy those needs.

Mr. President, I strongly urge the enactment of this bill.

I turn now from the detailed explanation of the provisions to a few general comments on the general law. For a little background on the matter, and exactly what is involved, I point out that the Fair Labor Standards Act, as I previously mentioned, was enacted in 1938 to meet the economic and social problems of that era, when, under the leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, we were emerging from the great depression. Low wages, long working hours, and high unemployment plagued the Nation, which was then in the midst of an unprecedented depression. The policy of the act, as set forth therein, was to correct and as rapidly as practicable to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers.

The Fair Labor Standards Act has proven through the years that its basic concept is sound. Despite the warnings of some critics who predicted the act would produce economic disaster, we have seen our economy emerge stronger than ever. Far from being an impediment to progress, the act has served as a foundation upon which has been built a standard of living for our citizens which, as a whole, is second to none. It has enabled countless Americans to enjoy a dignity, security, and a general well-being which would not otherwise have been possible.

The great depression of the 1930's is now behind us. Gone too, for most Americans, are the substandard wages and sweatshop conditions which were then commonplace. Nevertheless, successful as the 1938 act and its amendments have been in achieving its objectives, large numbers of workers in interstate commerce remain outside the scope of part or all of the protection of the act.

As noted by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

> The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 was a commitment to improve living standards by eliminating substandard working conditions in employment subject to Federal authority over interstate commerce. That commitment, incomplete when it was made, has become less complete with the passage of time. The law has not been kept in line with the advancing economy; and some of its guarantees mean less, comparatively, than they did 27 years ago.

Mr. President, the gap between the high earnings of the middle class and the low earnings of the lower class has widened. The earnings of the lower income group have become correspondingly lower when compared with the general income of other people than it was 27 years ago.

It is time for a new minimum wage law to give the people in the newly covered industries an opportunity to have the protection of this act.

It was evident to the committee that long working hours and wages which barely provide subsistence are still a daily way of life for far too many of our citizens. It was in recognition of this that the committee bill would extend the protection of the act to some 7.2 million workers, many of whom are among the lowest paid workers in the country.

Many of those people work in factories in jobs involving employment in excessive heat and other conditions detrimental to health.

At the present time there are over 60 million employed wage and salaried workers in the United States. Of this number, less than 10 million are public employees—7.2 million are State and local employees, and 2.3 million are Federal employees.

There are 47 million workers in private industry, of whom 29.6 million are presently covered by the act. Of the 7.2 million newly covered workers, 5.8 million are in private employment and 1.4 million are in public employment.

Mr. President, I think it is worthy of note that, of the 7.2 million newly covered workers, 1.4 million are in public employment. It was necessary that we have a new law to bring these people up to the very minimal standards.

Mr. President, of the 47,260,000 workers in private industry who are now under the coverage of the act, at this time 1.8 million are engaged in agricultural and fisheries industries; 559,000 are employed in mining; 3,029,000 are employed in contract construction; 15,851,000 are employed in manufacturing; 3,664,000 are employed in transportation, communications, and utilities; 3,015,000 are engaged in wholesale trade; 7,988,000 are employed in retail trade; 2,515,000 are employed in finance, insurance, and real estate; 6,253,000 are employed in services, excluding domestic service; and 2,504,000 are employed in what they call domestic service.

That is the total number of employees engaged in private industry, both covered and not covered. That is the source of the 60 million and of the 47 million.

Forty-seven million workers are engaged in industry, the exclusion there being domestic service which is not counted employment in industry. Out of that number, 29,500,000 are covered by the minimum wage law and 17⅔ million are not covered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD in the interest of saving time, so that I do not have to read it, a tabulation appearing on page 2 of the committee report.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated number of private nonsupervisory employees covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, by industry

[In thousands]

Industry	Total number of employees in private industry	Number of employees covered in private industry	Number of employees in private industry not covered or exempt
Agriculture and fisheries	1,882		1,882
Mining	559	554	5
Contract construction	3,029	2,413	616
Manufacturing	15,851	15,207	644
Transportation, communications, utilities	3,664	3,474	190
Wholesale trade	3,015	2,092	923
Retail trade	7,988	2,593	5,395
Finance, insurance, real estate	2,515	1,869	646
Services (excluding domestic service)	6,253	1,391	4,862
Domestic service	2,504		2,504
Total	47,260	29,593	17,667

NOTE.—These estimates do not include public employment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, in his message to Congress of May 18, 1965, urged the Congress to extend the protections of the act to needy workers and said:

> Many American workers whose employment is clearly within the reach of this law have never enjoyed its benefits. Unfortunately these workers are generally in the lowest wage groups and most in need of wage and hour protection. We must extend minimum wages and overtime protection to them.

The workers to whom the President referred are within the reach of the law because they are in interstate commerce and their work affects interstate commerce. They can therefore constitutionally be brought under the law.

Mr. President, I shall now read the number of employees—and the type work in which they are engaged—that we are bringing under this law for the first time. I want to point out the type of work they are engaged in.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a tabulation appearing on page 5 of the committee report entitled "Estimated Distribution of Private Nonsupervisory Employees Not Now Covered and the Number Who Would Be Brought Under Minimum Wage Protection of the Act of 1967 and 1969 by the Bill."

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated distribution of private nonsupervisory employees not now covered and the number who would be brought under minimum wage protection of the act in 1967 and 1969 by the bill [1]

[In thousands]

Industry	Private nonsupervisory employees not covered by the minimum wage provisions of the Federal Labor Standards Act	Employees added to minimum wage coverage			Total employees subject to minimum wage provisions
		1967	1969	Total	
Retail trade	3,642	1,155	345	1,500	4,086
Restaurants	1,753	300	125	425	432
Hotels and motels	549	240	35	275	275
Hospitals and related institutions	1,008	1,471		[2] 1,471	[2] 1,471
Miscellaneous services	1,460	20	30	50	349
Laundries	505	505		505	523
Agriculture	1,895	390		390	390
Transit systems	15	60	5	[3] 65	[3] 65
Agriculture in the area of production	90	90		90	90
Taxicabs	122	75	25	100	100
Small logging	87	37	[4] 12	49	49
Cotton ginning	34	34		34	34
Construction	583	581		581	2,994
Federal Government		685		685	685
All other industries	5,924	570	390	[5] 960	[5] 25,230
Total	17,667	6,213	967	[6] 7,180	[6] 36,773

[1] Based on estimated employment in 1964.
[2] Includes 463,000 employees of State and local government hospitals.
[3] Includes 55,000 employees of State and local government transit systems.
[4] Effective Feb. 1, 1968.
[5] Includes 170,000 employees of State and local government institutions of higher education.
[6] Includes 668,000 employees of State and local government agencies.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I shall now refer to the newly covered people who are being brought under the coverage of the minimum wage law for the first time.

In the retail trades there are approximately 1,500,000 workers. In the restaurants, there are approximately 425,000 people. In the hotel and motel industries there are approximately 275,000 people. In the hospitals and related institutions there are 1,471,000 people. There are 50,000 people who work in miscellaneous services. There are 505,000 people who work in laundries. There are 60,000 people working the transit systems. There are 90,000 people working in agriculture in the area of production; 100,000 people work in the taxicab industry; 49,000 people work in small logging crews; 34,000 people are employed in cotton ginning; 581,000 people are employed in construction; 685,000 people who work for the Federal Government will be covered. The total number of employees who will be covered in all other industries is 960,000. This makes a total of 6,790,000, and 390,000 in agriculture, for a total of 7,180,000 workers who will be brought under the coverage of this legislation for the first time.

Mr. President, the inclusion of these workers within the coverage of the act when the raises become effective in 1971 will bring them up to the minimum which is required to get them up to the poverty level—$3,000 annual income. I think the passage and enforcement of this legislation will be a forward step in the development of American social and economic well-being and the national well-being. We have many antipoverty programs. I think that bringing people up to this level of earnings is the first and basic antipoverty program that we ought to have in the country. I think it will do more good to pay the people living wages than would any other such program we have, although I have supported and am in favor of all the other programs aimed at relieving poverty in this country.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am the ranking minority member of the committee which has reported the bill, and also the ranking minority member of the subcommittee which dealt with the measure; and I wish on the whole, to commend the bill to the Senate.

Undoubtedly, amendments will be made to the bill—or, at least, will be considered by the Senate—but, fundamentally, the thrust of the bill, in my judgment, is eminently correct. In about a year and a half, it will result in putting the minimum wage at a level which, considering today's cost of living, represents an amount very close to the subsistence level; and it represents the traditional advance by workers in the United States, based upon the considerations of greater productivity and greater industrial power as a concrete base under the economy.

So, Mr. President, I believe that the first and basic decision is an economic decision, one of economic policy, and that we have made that decision affirmatively and quite correctly.

Mr. President, an important point which is frequently overlooked in these matters—because people argue so heatedly about individual details of the bill, many of which the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has properly and carefully discussed—is that the main thrust of the bill is basically to increase the minimum wage, to take into account the productive power of the country, and to represent another milestone in the forward progress of the American working man and woman at the lowest end of the scale.

First and foremost, therefore, let me speak to the propriety of this figure and of the dates upon which it shall take effect, because we will find, as we go along, that we will be debating many other matters, and this is the main point.

First, as to the propriety of the figure: Generally speaking, the States—certainly, the industrial States—have begun to recognize the need for a higher minimum wage.

My own State of New York is probably the largest business State in the country, in terms of population, output, and State and national product per annum. We have a $1.50 minimum wage. In many respects, the New York law is better than the bill before us. It is significant that over a year ago I introduced a bill for $1.50 minimum wage, which has been a crying need in the Nation for a long time.

The schedule in the bill demonstrates that on February 1, 1967, the minimum wage will be $1.40; on February 1, 1968, $1.60.

I should like to digress at this point, because these figures represent a material difference between the Senate bill and the bill in the other body, which delays the second increase for another year. There will be considerable argument about that, Mr. President, and the main reason for the debate will be that the swing this time—to wit in 1 year—is shorter than it has been traditionally. Traditionally the increase has not been quite so sharp.

Undoubtedly an excellent table will be shown to the Senate—as it was shown to us in committee—which graphically delineates that situation.

I think it is fair to say that we were guided in legislating for a year sooner than the other body by the fact that we felt $1.60 was overdue now, and that, hence, the sooner justice was available to those who are already covered under the minimum wage, the better it would be for

the Nation and for the cause of justice, so far as the individual worker is concerned.

Also, it is significant that for the roughly 7,200,000 employees to be newly covered, the rate of rise to the $1.60 level will be very much slower. Indeed, in the field of agriculture, $1.60 is not even provided for by the bill, the highest minimum wage being $1.30, to be attained February 1, 1969. Hence, we were taking care of the transitional people among those who are newly covered. We found, so far as those who are covered is concerned, that $1.60 is overdue, and that, therefore, any deferment was simply an accommodation to business opinion, which did not want the rate to rise right away. Really, we should have and could have legislated $1.60 as of February 1, 1967. I believe that those who oppose such a rise really have the burden to demonstrate that it should not have been done, because I consider the 1 year which was granted as simply a deference to business opinion, which I and others have acceded to along that line, but without really any substantive basis to justify it.

It is very important at a time when there is widespread discussion of inflation to consider inflation in respect to this proposal. The inflationary problem does not, in my judgment, relate to the minimum wage, certainly within the limits in which we are raising it. On the contrary, I believe it helps us to deal with the inflationary problem by spreading the capability for consumption much more widely by a modest increase above the present minimum wage when we have at the very lower end of the scale literally the poverty-stricken worker earning a minimum wage which is really inadequate to keep body and soul together today.

The working poor, who are the primary beneficiaries of the bill, should not be asked to bear the burden of anti-inflationary methods. I shall not discuss the inflationary situation now, because it is not apposite to this particular discussion. But certainly the pressure is on in terms of higher interest rates and will, with respect to homes and homebuilding particularly, as well as other aspects, bear down upon the working poor. Certainly, they are entitled to some help in meeting anti-inflationary pressures themselves through a modest increase in the minimum wage.

Nor is this situation affected by "guidelines," which relate to overall wages, and not to the people who are at the bottom of the ladder. We hear as an objection to an increase in the minimum wage that such an increase will cause the whole structure of wages to rise above that rate, and that there will be pressure to escalate higher wages above their present level because of the increase in the minimum wage.

Theoretically this may sound logical, but it is strictly superficial, because our experience up to now with other increases in the minimum wage has not shown that pattern.

There is an effort to increase wages. We have just seen that take place in the airline strike, and it will take place in connection with other businesses. The communication workers are now negotiating with respect to their contract. But the inflationary argument does not have relevance to a modest increase in the minimum wage of this character because the concrete base, as it stands today, is not taken into consideration—whether it will or will not support the increases sought. The $1.60 minimum will not—by raising the lowest plateau—cause a material effect on the structures above.

We are dealing strictly with a question of the underprivileged who are at the bare poverty level, and whom we are trying again to bring somewhat abreast of the new productivity, as well as new demands in terms of the cost of living in the country. These working poor are now caught in a squeeze. In many jobs there are greater technical requirements than they can meet. The cost of living, through an inflation to which they did not contribute, is presented to them from the other side. So they are entitled to some relief consistent with the productivity of the country.

I believe, on the economics, the $1.60 minimum obtained after a year and a half, stands up.

Dealing with the detailed aspects of the bill, there are many compromises in the bill. There was much discussion in the committee about various newly covered workers, in activities such as hospitals, logging, working for the Federal Government, and working in the Canal Zone. The question of transit employees was a very vexing one. We settled it by drawing a line between what we call large and small companies. Employees who are tipped represent a very grave problem. I think that we worked out a reasonably fair compromise on that problem.

In addition, an amendment was introduced by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], and carried through in the committee sponsored by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and myself, dealing with those called as witnesses in court. I believe it is a very important element of justice in this bill to look after the compensation of witnesses who appear in Federal courts, and who lose a day's pay or more, and it very much belongs in a bill of this character which deals with that kind of compensation.

There were compromises made in all of those matters, including hospital employees, parts men who work for automobile dealers, caretakers of apartment houses, various trainees in the retail and service trades, nursing homes, the cowboy—the range livestock employee, as we call him in a rather fancy way—the problems of those who work in sheltered workshops, the handicapped, those in the sugar industry and a few other categories. All of those compromises were, I think, fairly done and, I represent, on behalf of the minority, were hard fought, thoroughly scrutinized, and examined. There was an extraordinary and, I think, commendable absence of steamroller tactics in the committee. The subcommittee operated in a free, open, and democratic way under the chairmanship of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], to whom I pay tribute now.

The chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. YARBOROUGH] was most solicitous that, if humanly possible, nothing should be crammed down the throats of the minority. I feel that no such attitude characterizes any amendment, even those I lost or members of the minority lost, but a very fair effort was made to meet our views.

I come now to the aspect of new coverage, which is so vitally important in the bill. I know that in connection with newly covered nonfarm employees who are largely in the retail trades there is a big question with respect to the beginning point of gross volume of business under which such employees should be covered. In a stepdown process in the bill we finally arrived at $250,000 in annual gross volume after February 1, 1969.

The amount of gross volume is a vexing question, Mr. President, it seems to me. A very considerable period of time, nearly 3 years, is given for the retail trade to adjust to the provision, with minimum wages stepping up from only a dollar to the final $1.60 level on February 1, 1971. So every accommodation and consideration has been given to the small retailer who might meet the test of $250,000 in gross volume or more.

I wish to point out that there is no question about the fact that these are small retailers, when we get down to that level, especially with prices what they are today. But unless we are willing to subscribe to the position that in a period of 5 years every American who works for a living, at the very least should be entitled to $64 a week for a 40-hour week it seems to me that we beg the question and avoid our responsibility. Really, coverage should go down to $1 of sales, except that in that instance there would be involved a recordkeeping problem and there has to be some rough rule of thumb to exclude the very tiniest of enterprises. So, the $250,000 standard is not to be considered in terms of an equity judgment that small business should not have minimum wage employees, but rather a practical judgment that for a business that small—less than a quarter of a million dollars a year—it would be probably unfair and unreasonable, as so many are family owned and managed. For that reason, in my judgment, the $250,000 limit is intelligent and fair.

I make this statement because there are no economic theories which, in my judgment, would justify anyone in the United States working for less than a $1.60 an hour minimum, after 5 years, in the manufacturing industries or the service trades.

I conceive of the $250,000 limit as a practical limit in terms of obligations on the part of proprietors of businesses, and in terms of the U.S. Government which, through the Wage and Hour Division, must exercise supervision.

Mr. President, we come now to the question of agricultural employment, a problem which has vexed the committee. For the first time, agricultural workers are being covered. More and more people are leaving the farms and going to the cities. They are doing so for two reasons: One, conditions of living and opportunities for recreation, which may appeal to more people in the cities than

in the rural areas; but, two, also to take advantage of the economic opportunities which the cities offer.

The earnings level on the small- and medium-sized farm has tended to be quite low throughout the country.

In addition, farm labor has been difficult to obtain. The general standards of farm labor have lagged materially behind the standards of workers in industry and the service trades. There has been a great deal of investigation, especially by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], as chairman of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee, we have been appalled by the conditions—which we find to be intolerable in modern times—on the farm for migrant laborers. Here we are putting agricultural workers under some sort of minimum wage, again on a slowly stepped-up basis, adding only a ceiling of $1.30, on February 1, 1969, which represents an elementary measure—a recognition of the fact that farms, in so many cases now, are largely factories for the production of food and fiber. They are no longer the bucolic paradise which ancient legend and ideas would have us believe—not that it was anything but admirable and magnificent, and made our country what it is today.

This is another world and another day. Placing agricultural workers under the minimum wage is, at long last, an effort to recognize that fact.

I come now to the first of the committee amendments which I shall propose. Interestingly enough, this concept of a bucolic paradise, which did not influence the committee so far as putting agricultural workers under the minimum wage is concerned, suddenly obscured the vision of the majority of the committee when it came to child labor in agriculture. What was not a bucolic paradise became one. A majority of the committee turned against a prohibition on child labor generally, equivalent to the prohibition which we have had for many years in the industrial parts of the minimum wage law. This was attempted to be justified on two grounds: One, that it would be good for children outside of school hours to work on the farm; and, second, that the children of migratory workers could be much better looked after and cared for if they worked next to their parents.

The only concessions the committee made to child labor were: first, to state that children might not work during school hours—of course, as everyone knows, that is a flexible standard in many towns and villages throughout this country which have agricultural labor; and second, that children under 16 should not work in occupations described as "particularly hazardous" by regulations of the Department of Labor.

The fundamental idea that a child of any age, even one under 12, could work in the fields anywhere for piece-rate compensation, without a minimum wage or anything else, that such children could work next to their parents who were migratory laborers working in the fields, the committee refused to do anything about.

I think it is a great mistake. It is a throwback to another day. It is completely inconsistent with the recognition of the status of the agricultural worker as shown by giving him the minimum wage. I feel constrained, therefore, to bring in a child labor amendment which will complete the scheme of action with respect to child labor substantially as it is in the industrial section of the bill.

In my supplementary views, I have presented this matter in detail. At pages 70 to 73 of the committee report, the supplementary views, signed by myself and the Senator from New Jersey, [Mr. WILLIAMS], the problem is clearly set forth, with some graphic illustrations of how it works based upon investigations into the field of labor by children working in agriculture.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], may be made a cosponsor of my amendment No. 759.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the other point I wish to raise in the proper way, in the course of our discussion, is a section which we put into the airlines strike bill and which—very happily for all of us, because the airlines strike bill proved to be unnecessary—did not become law. That is, a mandate to the Secretary of Labor to come forward with recommendations, by the middle of January 1967, as to what should be done about strikes which represent a national emergency or which seriously jeopardize the national health and safety.

This is probably the only labor bill which the Senate will consider at this session of Congress; hence, it is my hope that the provision which seemed to find great favor here and which seemed to find much support in the other body may be made a part of the bill and be the subject of our conference in what is a highly essential action by the executive department in this field, where we were found to be vulnerable both in the 1963 firemen's and enginemen's threatened strike and in the airlines machinists' strike.

Finally, every member of the minority feels that it is his duty to raise one other question concerning the bill—that is, the question of age discrimination in employment. It properly belongs, in our judgment, under the administration of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor. This is where we dealt with the question of nondiscrimination in employment on the basis of sex. We believe that age discrimination in employment represents a serious question before the country. Many States have already taken action to seek to eliminate it. We believe that the pending bill is the proper place in which to seek to eliminate it on the Federal level.

Thus, I shall have the honor, together with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], of sponsoring that amendment to the pending bill.

To sum up, we have a minimum wage bill which in its minimum wage coverage takes account of the productivity and the cost of living. It is not inflationary because it deals with the lowest wage element in the population. It merely serves to correct an inequity, in that these workers are materially lagging behind the parade.

It is not inflationary in its effect upon the higher wage and salary levels, because experience has shown the two do not have a direct relationship, though superficially many businessmen are afraid of it. When the minimum wage plateau has been raised to a moderate level, it does not bring about wage demands at higher levels which are quite outside this compass.

Finally, we are covering new categories in the retail trade, which need to be covered. We have drawn the line at $250,000. That line was drawn for practical reasons, not for economic reasons, because, economically, everyone should be entitled to have a minimum wage, whether he works in an establishment doing $250,000 worth of business or not. But the practicality involved is that it is difficult to enforce such a law in very small establishments.

We have covered agricultural workers. It is high time they were covered, because, as I have said, they are, in effect, factories operating turning out food and fibers.

There are amendments, as I have said, which I shall propose with respect to child labor, as well as with respect to emergency strikes, which is necessary in getting the Secretary of Labor to make recommendations. And there is a proposal against discrimination in employment on account of age.

I commend the bill and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who has done an extraordinarily fine and just job in bringing the bill to its present state. The amendments which I shall propose do not go to the essence of the bill, with which I thoroughly agree.

I believe we have the very great privilege of having an opportunity to pass a measure which represents a necessary element of justice to what are called the "working poor" in our country, which can only be a benefit to our overall economy and contribute to the prosperity of our beloved country.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from New York, who is the ranking minority member of the committee, and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee which considered the bill, not only for his kind and generous remarks, but for his faithful attendance at the meetings of the subcommittee and of the full committee.

This bill is not before the Senate as a result of some sudden hearing. I point out that the subcommittee had public hearings on amending the Fair Labor Standards Act last year, commencing on July 6, 1965. Those hearings in 1965 continued for 9 days, until July 16. They

were resumed in January of 1966 for 3 days. Testimony was received from 125 witnesses, including the Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, and other witnesses from government, industry, labor, and other interested groups.

In addition, hundreds of letters, statements, and additional information which was submitted to the committee were included in the hearing record. The hearing record consists of these three volumes which I hold in my hand. There is an additional fourth volume of the hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, chaired by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. So we have four volumes of hearings on this bill.

The subcommittee had 38 calendar days of consideration of the bill, including 14 days of actual committee meetings and executive sessions. The consideration of the bill spread over 36 days, including 4 days of actual hearings, and we had live quorums on those 14 days, due to the cooperation of the minority. Members of the minority did not stay away from the committee in an effort to try to kill the bill, as we have seen happen previously. It did not happen in this instance.

Under the leadership of the senior Senator from New York, the Members came, helped form a quorum, and worked on the bill, not as obstructionists, but with honest differences of opinion. I may point out that the full membership of the committee is 16. We sometimes had votes of 8 to 8. Votes of 9 to 7 were frequent.

I think it is a good bill. I did not agree with every provision of it, but I believe it is time to move forward and bring this bill to action.

We had 8 days of consideration in the full committee, spread over quite a few calendar days.

I want to thank all members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the minority members as well as the majority, for their faithful attendance and for enabling us to have live quorums. Under the rules of our committee, a quorum consists of a majority; we must have nine members present. We had those quorums present and we were able to conduct our hearings. The members of the minority cooperated. They offered amendments. The distinguished Senator from New York, as the leader of the members of his party on the committee, as well as the other members of the committee, are responsible for bringing this bill before the Senate. It is an important measure, affecting millions of people, millions of families, and the well-being of our Nation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to my colleague for his gracious remarks. I would like to pay tribute to my colleagues of the minority who were diligent in their work and study of the bill and in their attendance and in their very constructive efforts to act with respect to the bill in a most responsible manner. They will be heard individually. We are not all of the same point of view, but every point of view was articulated, after sound study, on both sides of the question.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF REASON FOR SENATOR MURPHY'S ABSENCE DURING CONSIDERATION OF BILL

Before I yield the floor, Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], who is a member of the minority on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and who had a very important part in shaping this measure, and amendments to it—some of which prevailed, some of which did not—will, most regrettably, not be present in the consideration and votes on the bill. He has been required, in the interest of his health, to enter the hospital for a minor operation. He will be spending some days recuperating before he returns to Washington, as he literally exhausted his voice in extensive speaking engagements since his election. He wants to go ahead with his duties this fall, but he will be absent in the interim, in order that he may again be able to proceed with his vigorous efforts. He will be greatly missed. We shall do our utmost to reflect the views of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. The bill in many aspects bears his stamp.

I speak with regret, but as a matter of necessity, to account for the absence of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I am not opposed to the concept of a minimum wage and I support every measure which will, in my opinion, improve the economic welfare of American workers. I am not persuaded, however, that this bill in its present form constitutes such a measure.

I believe sound economic and fiscal policies which are the best insurance of a high level of general business activity will, in turn, assure profitable employment and adequate jobs for our citizens. Our past prosperity and the enormous expansion of our economy have developed under these sound principles.

This bill runs contrary to these principles and seems to proceed on the theory that it is a simple matter to legislate wages and that it is not necessary to pay heed to such basic factors as productivity, supply and demand, and competition. To ignore these principles in normal times is dangerous. But to do so now in a time of high inflationary pressures and sky-high Government expenditures is to gamble with the economic health of our country.

Today, everyone from the President to the so-called man on the street is alarmed over the growing threat of inflation to our economic well-being. The President has established guidelines in an effort to curb these pressures. Yet in the face of all this concern the amendments here proposed would force prices upward from 5 to 10 percent. These figures were revealed in a survey by the largest retail association in the country. Operators of 339 retail stores in 38 States say that price rises will be necessary to cope with the higher costs that would be forced upon them by this bill.

One of my principal objections to this bill is that it contemplates an increase to the $1.60 minimum at far too fast a rate, which could result in the loss of jobs. As reported by the committee this bill would provide for a 20-cent minimum wage increase to become effective on February 1, 1968, only 12 months after the economy has absorbed the 15-cent increase to $1.40. This is an increase of over 14 percent. Contrast this with the 3.2 percent Presidential guidepost figure and the highly inflationary effect of this bill will be apparent. It should be clear that a minimum wage increase which is forced upon the economy at too fast a rate to be properly absorbed can only produce circumstances under which the American worker will have less dollar for dollar purchasing power than he has today.

In subcommittee, I offered an amendment which would have made the $1.60 rate effective in February 1970. This would have spread the 14.3-percent increase over a 3-year period and would have produced a yearly increase of approximately 4.7 percent, a figure considerably less inflationary and more in line with the guidelines. This amendment was rejected with a minimum discussion of its merits. In the full committee I offered an amendment which would have stretched the increase to $1.60 over a 2-year period. This amendment would have produced a percentage increase of 7.2 percent, a figure considerably in excess of the guidelines but far easier on the economy than the committee's 14.3 percent. But even this attempt to ease the adjustment of the higher rate was summarily rejected.

In my individual views there appears a chart showing the pattern of minimum wage increases and effective dates established in past amendments to this act. From this chart it will be seen that the 36-month stretchout is actually within the pattern but that the 12-month and even the 24-month periods break this historical pattern and are without precedent in almost three decades of minimum wage legislative history. In my opinion, the failure to remedy this highly inflationary stepup to the $1.60 rate will be a serious mistake.

Another feature of this bill disturbs me. The committee lowered the present $1 million volume-enterprise cutoff test to $500,000 in 1967 and to $250,000 in 1969. I offered an amendment in committee to hold this figure at $500,000 because, in my opinion, the record clearly established that such an amendment was necessary to protect small business.

The amendment was not accepted. This was interesting in view of what this committee's report had to say in 1961 about the $1 million volume-enterprise test which had just been approved. On page 44, Senate Report No. 145, 87th Congress, 1st session, there appears the following:

> This volume of purchase and receipts of interstate goods, together with the gross annual sales volume of $1 million or more exclusive of specified taxes, should provide more than adequate assurance that the newly covered enterprises will be those plainly engaged to a substantial extent in interstate commerce and should make it abundantly certain that no small local business will be affected.

The present bill, which covers enterprises doing an annual volume of $500,000

or more in 1967, and which would extend this coverage to those enterprises doing more than $250,000 in 1969 departs substantially from the principles quoted above. Is it possible that in the short space of 5 years our opinions on this vital point have changed 75 percent? Is it now felt that a small store with, say, six or eight employees, should be subject to the voluminous provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act? That the proprietors of these stores should have to try to cope with the restrictions set forth in some 300 pages of rules, regulations, and interpretations that accompany the act is certainly beyond the realm of practicality.

The proposed coverage brings small local business immediately into coverage. There are no exact figures on how many retail establishments would be affected by the bill, but there are definite indications that the number is substantial.

The 1963 Census of Business reports that there were 24,600 single-unit retail establishments doing between $500,000 and $1 million. These independent individual stores were owned or operated by a single proprietor, partnerships, or corporation, but were not connected with any other store. In the category between $300,000 and $500,000 there were 37,500 single-unit stores. Thus we have a minimum of 62,100 single-unit stores which would be affected by the provisions of the bill. To this number could be added stores doing between $250,000 and $300,000—for which the census provides no breakdown, and a number of small retail, multiunit enterprises—two, three, or four stores for the most part, whose combined volume would be substantially less than $1 million. The number of employees involved (Bureau of Labor Statistics) is approximately 960,000.

This bill would force a 60-percent increase in the legal minimum wage in the short period from 1967 to 1971 for some of the smallest stores in the Nation. Even those stores presently covered would find their profits either drastically reduced or disappearing entirely. In fact, at the $1.60 rate, 42 percent of the stores indicate that they would be operating at a loss of varying degrees, even though steps were taken to reduce operating expenses.

Even raising prices will not solve all the problems. Businessmen state they will have to reduce their work forces substantially and even then will be faced with the grave problem of whether or not they can remain in business.

Higher prices, fewer jobs, and the curtailment of small business in this country might be an oversimplification of the end results of the proposals contained in this report, but the fact remains this is what may happen.

If we are concerned with the devastating effects of inflation, the plight of the unskilled and untrained worker, and the survival of the small businessman, and if we are interested in preserving the urban areas of our cities and towns, then we must provide for excluding from the act the smaller enterprises. In my opinion a cutoff volume enterprise test of $500,000 is a reasonable compromise between existing law and the committee's proposal.

Without the amendments I have suggested, this bill may well contribute to increased living costs and more unemployment among the unskilled—the exact opposite of what all of us are trying to achieve.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTION OF COMMITTEE REPORT (NO. 1478)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a correction be made in the committee report (No. 1487) on the pending bill, H.R. 13712. In a quotation from the bill, the last three words on line 12, page 52, read "any highly perishable." The word "highly" is in error, and I ask unanimous consent that that word be deleted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The first three words of line 17 on page 52 read "highly perishable agricultural." The word "highly" is included in error at that point also, and I ask unanimous consent that it be deleted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The official bill as filed is correct, but this error in the report was picked up from a print before technical corrections were made in committee, and these two words were included in the report in error.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Are there any amendments pending to the pending bill, H.R. 13712?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Are there any other amendments pending to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No further amendments are in order.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, if there are no further amendments——

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, which was just agreed to, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot reserve the right to object at this time. The Senator may ask for a quorum call.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 219 Leg.]

Boggs	Javits	Neuberger
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Carlson	Magnuson	Russell, S.C.
Dirksen	Mansfield	Stennis
Douglas	McIntyre	Symington
Fannin	Monroney	Tydings
Hart	Montoya	Williams, Del.
Hill	Morse	Yarborough

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be

directed to request the presence of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana. [Putting the question.] The motion is agreed to; and the Sergeant at Arms is directed to execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Muskie
Allott	Griffin	Nelson
Anderson	Harris	Pastore
Bass	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Bayh	Holland	Pell
Bible	Hruska	Prouty
Brewster	Inouye	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Robertson
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Russell, Ga.
Case	Kennedy, Mass.	Saltonstall
Church	Lausche	Scott
Clark	Long, La.	Smathers
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Smith
Cotton	McCarthy	Sparkman
Curtis	McClellan	Talmadge
Dodd	McGee	Thurmond
Dominick	McGovern	Tower
Eastland	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Morton	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	Mundt	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I explain one thing for the benefit of my fellow Senators?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend until order is restored. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats.

The Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. We had thought, Mr. President, that votes on amendments to the pending measure—and there are a number of amendments—would be deferred for a little time, because the report on the bill has just been placed on Senators' desks this morning. That is the explanation I offer to the Senate for what might seem to be a slight delay.

I understand now, after having consulted with the majority and minority leaders, that within the bounds of reason and propriety, we are ready to consider anything that any Senator wishes to bring up.

I understand some Senators have amendments. We would rather hope—and it shall be my duty, pursuant to the wishes of the minority leader, to make sure—that we will not actually vote finally on the bill, or even close it off from further amendment, until tomorrow; but certainly the business of the Senate can go forward with speed and efficiency as far as we are concerned.

The explanation for the hour, 1:45, is only the fact that Senators should have had an opportunity to read the report, which I hope very much they have had by now; the minority leader quite properly wished to give them that opportunity, and I have acted accordingly.

So I hope very much that now, if Senators have amendments, that they may be brought forward and proposed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I can understand why the amendments may not be ready for this bill. After all, we should face the fact that while this bill, as I understand, was ordered reported about 10 days ago, it was not presented to the Senate until late yesterday afternoon, and no Senator except the members of the committee has had a chance to see it until about 2 hours ago.

I do not see any excuse for that. This measure has been before us for the last several months, and to suddenly bring it out here and ask Senators to vote on it before they have had a chance to read it overnight, I think, is indefensible. This Texas steamroller has got to slow down. I do not think we should take any action on it today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Of course.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to assure the Senator that this bill does not stand the chance of a snowball in Hades of passing today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have hopes about tomorrow. However, it may even be Saturday before we get final passage. We did try to get copies of the bill and the report distributed to all offices around 8:30 or 9 o'clock this morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The majority leader has been very fair about the matter. But some of us were rather disturbed awhile ago when we found there was an effort to get the third reading on the bill and foreclose amendments before we had even had a chance to look at it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There was no effort or intention to get a third reading today.

Mr. JAVITS. May I explain to the Senator from Delaware that sometimes the practice on the floor brings one almost to the breaking point. There was nobody here. The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] was practically alone. I necessarily had to go over to the Rayburn Building for a few minutes; and at the moment, there did not seem to be any other course to follow but to let the matter run its course. But that was promptly righted, and I know the majority leader would have been the first to undo it, even if it had, in an untoward way, occurred.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there was no effort to pass the bill in the absence of opposition. We made efforts here from 10 o'clock until 1:25 to get some Senators onto the floor. But for the most important measure of this session, we did not have 10 Senators here, from both parties, for 3 hours and 25 minutes. So we finally took measures to get a few Senators onto the floor. We knew they had been talking about amendments.

We all know the importance of this measure, to raise the minimum wages of 30 million Americans who now receive a minimum wage that practically puts them in the poverty bracket, if all they receive is the minimum wage, and to bring under coverage 7,200,000 more Americans.

I think if Senators have amendments or positions on the bill, they ought to be stated. So after 2 hours, after taking action to obtain a live quorum, we have a majority here.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would not want the RECORD to stand precisely that way, and give a misimpression to the public. The fact of the matter is that we on the Judiciary Committee met at 9:30, and were in session until after 12 o'clock. We had one vote after another. We accomplished very little; we raced up and down hill; but there was a full attendance. The Appropriations Subcommittees were in session, marking up bills.

So if anybody reads the statement of my friend the Senator from Texas, and concludes that Senators were remiss in their duty, the fact is that we had agreed that committees could meet until 12 o'clock, so that they could go ahead with the business of the Senate. In consequence, Senators cannot be here and in the committees at the same time. I think that situation was universally true for nearly every standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I was not attempting to place any onus on the minority party for any delay.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, not our party alone.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. As had been stated earlier, under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from New York, the minority party very faithfully came to the many executive sessions we had in the commitee on this bill, and it was with the full cooperation of the minority that we brought the bill to the floor, by a vote of 15 to 0, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A period of 38 days was covered in the Labor Subcommittee in the consideration of amendments, including 14 days of active session, and over a month in the full committee, with many days in session. As was pointed out earlier, some of the amendments were tied, in the committee, by a vote of 8 to 8, and were lost. Some were agreed to by a vote of 9 to 7. We had full representation, and we had a live quorum every day.

Now, after this long and diligent effort by the Labor Subcommittee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, over a period of 2 months, we have brought the bill to the floor. There was great interest, and many amendments suggested, and we wanted to try to get these amendments going.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yet, in line with what the distinguished Senator from Delaware has said, I came on the floor at 4 o'clock yesterday, and we had a hassle, wherein a great point was made of the fact that my staff could not even obtain a copy of the bill. Finally someone went out somewhere, returned, and said, "Oh, there are copies around." Then I picked up the report that the majority Members could get copies, but minority Members could not.

I said, "We are not ready to consider the bill," and suggested to the distinguished majority leader that they call up the Oregon dunes bill.

The distinguished Senator who is so unalterably opposed to the Oregon dunes bill was not, evidently, ready to have it called up, although another Senator from the great Commonwealth of Oregon was more than delighted to have it come up forthwith.

So we left the minimum wage bill in place and tried to work it out. We were sparring in order to try to find some time to look at the bill. I had a chance to look at it as I came into town from where I live, but I did not have a copy of the report and have not seen the report yet.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader for cooperating with the majority leader. They have agreed that we may have votes today. I think I may advise the distinguished minority leader that copies of the bill were in the portfolio of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the ranking minority member of the committee, and that copies were distributed at that time. The minority leader stated that at 4 o'clock only a few Senators had copies, but counsel for the able Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] had a sizable number of copies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We did not know where to get them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 760 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

TITLE VIII—STUDY OF EMERGENCY STRIKE LAWS

SEC. 801. The Secretary of Labor is hereby directed to commence immediately a complete study of the operations and adequacy of the emergency labor disputes provisions of the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act. The Secretary is further instructed to report to the Congress by January 15, 1967, the findings of such study together with appropriate recommendations for such amendments to the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act as will provide improved permanent procedures for the settlement of emergency labor disputes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the honor to ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] may be joined with me in offering the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senate will recall that when the airlines labor dispute bill was before the Senate, we spent, in the course of the debate, a great deal of time on the fact that there was not a remedy at law to which the President could resort in the circumstances we then faced, but that we had to provide an ad hoc remedy in the face of an emergency.

It will be remembered that we ran into the same situation in the threatened strike of the locomotive enginemen and firemen a few years ago. At that time, too, the Nation faced an emergency overnight, and Congress resorted finally to what it did not call, but what was tantamount to, compulsory arbitration—an action that made most of us very unhappy, because I and many other Senators are against compulsory arbitration as a national policy, and have been for years.

In this particular situation the joint resolution we finally agreed to by using, through the great resourcefulness of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the existing techniques of the Railway Labor Act, would have made us responsible as a matter of law for calling the men back for 30 days. This would be again a most distasteful operation as far as the Senator from Oregon and I are concerned. I am sure that it would be distasteful to practically every other Senator.

Having run into that situation at the national level on two successive occasions, the senior Senator from Oregon and I put our heads together to see whether, at long last, the administration could be brought to the point of meeting what we consider to be its responsibility in making some recommendations on this score to us.

Various bills have been introduced. The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has a bill which would provide for compulsory arbitration in disputes of this character. I have introduced a bill which would apply the technique of receivership through the Federal courts and operation of the struck facilities to the limited extent required by the public health and safety under Federal receivership.

Other Senators have other ideas concerning a solution to this problem. The upshot was that we did not feel we could, with the time now available for testimony in this session of Congress, come to a choice among the various means of solving the problem.

The administration is really under a duty to give us its views as to how it feels about the matter.

Based on our mutual judgment, we offered an amendment which was incorporated in the airlines strike legislation passed by the Senate. Whatever may have been the controversy engendered on both sides, there was no controversy on this section. It seemed to be universally approved. My soundings in the other body indicate that there was rather universal approval there as well.

This amendment to the bill is offered for the reason that this is perhaps the only bill from the Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that we will have the opportunity to deal with at this session of Congress.

It seems to me, therefore, that this is an opportunity to do something constructive—something which is pretty generally agreed to and which can be incorporated in the pending bill.

I would state as one of the conferees, and I undoubtedly will be, if the manager of the bill runs into any trouble with this particular section—if he should agree to accept it, and I hope he will—I would be the first not to let such trouble interfere with the passage of the minimum wage law.

I rather hope, under the circumstances—as everybody pretty well agrees that this is the right thing to do and that this is the vehicle through which we can do it—that we can agree to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the senior Senator from New York in offering the amendment.

It does not deal with minimum wages directly, but I think the next to the last point the senior Senator from New York made should be controlling.

I do not think that we have any other vehicle by which we can get this matter before Congress. We certainly do not have to hold hearings on the question of whether the Secretary of Labor should be instructed to study the problem of labor legislation to handle emergency disputes and, in effect, that is all that this amendment would do.

I recall the position that the President took in his state of the Union message, in which there was a promise from the administration that it was going to submit legislation in this field.

Congress has a clear obligation now to make perfectly clear to the administration that it has an interest in having such legislation submitted. However, what we are saying to the administration, in effect, is: "We think you ought to proceed with a study and have the results of the study available when we reconvene so that this can be interpreted."

In my judgment this amendment instructs the administration to proceed with a study to carry out a promise that the administration, in effect, made last January.

I endorse the amendment. I have served on the committee with the senior Senator from New York. I hope that my friend, the very able chairman of the committee, will agree to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I repeat again that I assure the Senator from Texas, should this represent any block in getting the minimum wage bill through because the other body might object to something contained in it, I would be the first to join in taking the amendment out of the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I shall yield first to the senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, during the discussion of the bill on the airlines strike, statements were repeatedly made that we should do something to provide an improved, permanent remedy for the solution of threatened strikes that affect the national interests. My judgment is that the passing away of the airlines strike should not lull us into a state of inactivity. The repeated threat of the type of problems that confronted us in the airlines strike will be with us in the

future. In my judgment, it would be a mistake to fail to act in advance of the emergencies that might occur.

The amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] merely requests that the Secretary of Labor is directed to commence immediately a complete study of the operations and adequacy of the emergency labor dispute provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

That is one of the pointed issues that we had before us.

I think this is a sound amendment. It ought to be accepted by the manager of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the senior Senator from Ohio, very much for his support. He has been one of the leaders in this effort and has introduced a bill, to which I referred.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wholly support the amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York, and its purpose.

It has been more than 8 months now since the President said that he was going to send up recommendations on this very subject. Congress has not received, to the best of my knowledge, even one postcard from the President on this particular subject. I suspect that we will not get any unless we force it by some direction and legislation.

I hope that we will keep this provision in the bill when it comes to conference and that the conferees really fight for its retention.

It seems to me that if we do not get any kind of a definitive recommendation from the administration, or from the Secretary of Labor, by January 15 or earlier, Congress itself should, through its Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, initiate a study of the procedures which it thinks could handle this type of problem in which the public interest is so definitely involved.

So I urge not only that this amendment be adopted, but that we also preplan some hearings next year at the latest, so that we can go forward on suggestions of our own in the event the suggestions from the Secretary of Labor do not materialize.

Mr. JAVITS. I say to my colleague, the Senator from Colorado, that should, happily, this provision survive the legislative process—and I rather hope and believe that it will, because of the feeling for it which the Senator has so eloquently expressed—it will give us a proper basis for action. Not only is the Secretary asked to give us a report of his recommendations, but he is also asked to make a study of the past, as to how this has operated. Hence, we will have the great benefit of a really basic document upon which hearings can be intelligently held.

I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I ask the Senator from New York whether the Secretary of Labor, in his testimony before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in testifying on this bill—or, more particularly, upon the bill which was reported to deal with the airline strike—indicated whether or not he is making any study of the issue which is presented in this amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. We questioned him on that subject, and he said he was giving the matter thought and inquiry. As a matter of fact—I am drawing on my recollection—I think he expressed no feeling at all, but that this was quite proper, and he would be ready to respond in accordance with our request.

I should like to say to the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Colorado that I really do not consider this putting any pressure on the administration. With respect to the airline strike, we, in this body, discussed a shared partnership, as it was so often referred to, and the administration is very diffident about proceeding along this line, but it will proceed if we move, too. And in this way we are moving, too. We are saying, "Let us have it." And I have no doubt that we will get it, and everything the Secretary said would bear that out.

Mr. COOPER. I certainly think that this amendment should be adopted, and it should be maintained in conference; because if it is maintained in conference, it would at least express the sense of Congress that this study is necessary and that some action is necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. May I say to the Senator from Kentucky, that the position of the Secretary of Labor before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, during our discussion of proposed legislation dealing with the airlines strike, can best and fairly be described as an attitude of not wishing to make any commitments whatsoever as to future plans of the Secretary or of the administration in this field.

It was understandable, for their position was pretty much that of a parliamentary eunuch. They were not for legislation, and they were not against legislation. I thought they were quite sterile in the field.

The purpose of this amendment is for Congress to express legislative right. We cannot make them make recommendations to us. But if we respectfully, as this amendment does, request them to make recommendations and they do not, then it becomes the clear duty of Congress to go ahead and legislate in accordance with its best wisdom. That would not produce the most cooperative relationship, I should think, between the executive and the legislative branches.

My motivation in so far as this amendment is concerned—and I have a right to speak of its motivation, because I joined the Senator from New York when it was offered in connection with the airline strike—and I know it is also the motivation of the Senator from New York—is to make perfectly clear to the administration that we stand in a cooperative willingness to work with them in trying to develop the best legislation that can be developed.

If they do not want to cooperate, they will not carry out the requests of this amendment. But then, come January, there is no doubt, in my judgment, about what Congress will be faced with: It will have to pass legislation then of its own making.

Mr. JAVITS. Perhaps it will be of enlightenment to Senators if I read the President's answer at a press conference on July 20, 1966, when this controversy was raging. He was asked about the statement in his state of the Union message in January, to which Senator MORSE referred, as to this legislation, and he said:

> I must frankly say to you that up until this point we have been unsuccessful in getting legislation that the Secretary of Labor and the other members of my Cabinet felt acceptable and that we felt would have any chance of passage in the Congress.
>
> We are still searching for the answer, and we would like to find a solution that could be embraced by the administration, management, labor, and the Congress. Up to this point we have not been very successful.

I cite that only to underline the point that there is no dearth of thinking, investigation, and inquiry about this matter.

I am sure that they have their report all written as to what has happened. They probably do not have their recommendation, and that is exactly why this amendment is offered. We want to bring them to the point where they will have to think in concrete terms and be of some aid to us in that regard.

I hope very much that, under the circumstances I have referred to, the manager of the bill might be willing to take this amendment to conference.

(At this point Mr. TYDINGS assumed the chair as the Presiding Officer.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from New York drags a new subject matter into the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, which proposes to raise the minimum wages for American workers and to bring within the protection of this law 7,200,000 workers not now protected by minimum wages. It would drag in a new subject matter—amendment of the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act.

If the Senate had the rules of germaneness that exist in the House, the amendment would go out on the basis of germaneness. It is not germane. We are dealing here simply with an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act. The proposed amendment deals with the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act, dealing with labor disputes. The amendment drags up the airline labor dispute again.

From the statements that we have heard about the President's recommendations, it is patent that this amendment deals with something wholly outside the realm of the legislation now pending before the Senate.

The President's Labor-Management Advisory Council has made recommendations in the field of labor-management

relations in the settlement of emergency labor disputes.

As indicated by the Senator from New York, the President indicated in his press conference that the various department heads studying the problem had not as yet reached an agreement.

The proposed amendment directs the Secretary of Labor to commence immediately a complete study of the operations and adequacy of the emergency labor disputes provisions of the Railway Labor Act, which is not involved in the bill pending before the Senate, and the Labor-Management Relations Act, which is not involved in the bill pending before the Senate.

The proposed amendment would further instruct the Secretary to report back next year with appropriate recommendations for such amendments to the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act. It does not direct him to report back proposed amendments to this law, but rather, recommendations in connection with other laws "as will provide improved permanent procedures for the settlement of emergency labor disputes," which brings up the whole question of compulsory arbitration and free collective bargaining.

Those are subjects with which we are not concerned in this bill. I oppose the amendment because of the utterly unrelated matter that it injects into the act that we are considering now. It is irrelevant to this proposal, unconnected and unrelated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think that I have covered the entire subject, as referred to by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], in the presentation of the amendment. The amendment is not entirely unrelated. I cannot agree to that.

This is a labor bill dealing with the terms and conditions and compensation of employees. It has many provisions with respect to overtime which relate to unionized employees, bus workers, and many other types of employees. The union collective bargaining problems are very real with regard to the bill.

But I would not pretend for a moment that this particular amendment which I propose to add is directly germane to the matter of minimum wages. It has a relevance to the labor picture, which is also dealt with in the bill.

I said clearly when I started that this is probably the only labor bill that will be passed this year and, hence, we are suggesting that it be used as a vehicle for something which seems to be generally agreed in both bodies of the Congress. It follows on the heels of an effort to do the same thing in the Senate, in the airlines strike bill, but it was aborted because the legislation was deemed to be not necessary in the House of Representatives.

I stated for myself that if it should appear in conference that this title would in any way interfere with the adoption of the minimum wage bill, I would be the first not to let it stand in the way.

Under those circumstances, it seems to me that what we are doing is entirely proper. This is not at all unusual in this body. We have done this time and again with bills that go to various committees to get a particular measure taken care of before Congress adjourns for the year.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is being incongruous. As I remember, he sought to override his own GI bill of rights, which was an excellent piece of legislation, by an amendment on the most ungermane piece of legislation which possibly could have been attached. I did not object. No one else objected. We are accustomed to that in this body. Hence, I think that this objection is not an appropriate one in a matter of this kind where time is of the essence. If we let the situation go now, another year will pass and we will have another emergency. For example, American Airlines is on a standby order now until September 28. Again, we are dealing with a big segment of the air transportation industry. Let us get something started to get out of this cul de sac in which we are lodged.

As I have said, this should not be allowed to interfere with the minimum wage bill. I will move heaven and earth to see that it does not.

I can see the validity of the objection. The Senator is proper in making his objection if he does not wish to take the amendment, and we will have to have the Senate decide the matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, legislation by way of nongermane amendments in the Senate has become a very germane procedure of legislating in the Senate. We do it over and over again. Of course, it would be very helpful to have this amendment adopted by the Senate and sent to conference, because it would be a very respectful notice sent to the administration that we think it has a clear obligation to make its recommendations by January to the Congress as to what, if anything, it proposes to do about the legislation for the handling of emergency disputes when those disputes arise, either under the jurisdiction of the Taft-Hartley Act or the Railway Labor Act.

I very well understand the position of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. I have stood in his place as the floor manager of a bill many times and made the same sort of argument which he has made in opposition to this amendment as floor manager of the bill.

But the responsibility rests not on the floor manager of the bill but on the Senate as a whole, and I think this amendment should go to a vote.

Mr. President, if there are sufficient Senators to request a rollcall vote, I call for it.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request and yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I believe that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We have just had a very reassuring statement by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that if we would accept the amendment, that he, as the ranking minority member on the committee and one who is certain to be on the conference committee—as would the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—would not let it stand in the way of a minimum wage bill if the House did not accept it.

If the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] makes the same assurance, as one of the leading conferees on the part of the Senate and the majority, we can take it to conference.

Mr. MORSE. I shall fight as hard as I can to get it accepted in conference. That is the only commitment I can make.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I would like to ask the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] if he speaks for the minority party.

Mr. JAVITS. No, I do not.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the floor. I shall yield to the Senator, but first, I wish to finish my statement.

I think that my attitude is the same as that of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], but I do not speak for him. I speak for myself.

I, too, will fight very hard, to the limit of my power, to get this accepted by the conference, but I will not allow the minimum wage bill to fall because of my devotion to the amendment, if that is the way it should develop. I would not wish to be responsible, by my devotion to the amendment, for the minimum wage bill not being enacted. That is the meaning of my intention, and I restate it. I cannot speak for the Senator, but I feel as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] does. I will fight to the limit of my power.

Mr. MUSKIE. If the Senator reads the twinkle in the eyes of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—which will not appear in the RECORD—he will have all the assurance he needs.

Mr. MORSE. Do not be fooled by twinkle.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. My opposition to the amendment has been based on its lack of germaneness, but it is deeper. The amendment presupposes that we do need legislation in this field. We have had no testimony in this connection on the Fair Labor Standards Act. There has been no testimony whether an amendment is needed to the Railway Labor Act or the Labor-Management Relations Act. I personally am not willing to prejudge the matter and say that we need an amendment and we want the administration to tell us that.

I think this is a complicated field and I would not vote for any amendment until after there was a complete hearing and a showing as to what kind of amendments were needed. I think the field of free collective bargaining is one of the basic freedoms in our entire American free enterprise system.

On the assurance of the distinguished Senator from New York that he will lead the conference representing his party, and that he will not, so far as he is personally concerned, let an amendment which is on an unrelated and ungermane subject stand in the way of a minimum

wage bill, I will agree to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8989) to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. POWELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Mr. AYRES, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. ASHBROOK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13448) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORRISON, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. CORBETT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

FEDERAL METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINE SAFETY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the State to the bill (H.R. 8989) to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. FANNIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

CWA-WESTERN ELECTRIC LABOR NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recently, we have heard widespread complaints that the American system of collective bargaining between labor and management has become an inefficient process and that, as a result, the American public has been subject, if not to actual hardship, then to considerable inconvenience.

For that reason, I find it all the more significant that in the telephone industry there appears to be a most determined effort to make collective bargaining work.

I refer specifically to negotiations between the Communications Workers of America and the management of the Western Electric Co., concerning the wages, benefits, and working conditions of approximately 23,000 employees in the company's installation division.

I have no inside information as to the progress of those negotiations. Quite properly, as befits the collective bargaining process, they are being conducted in the privacy of the conference room. But it is impressive that, after preliminary sparring, the two sides are bargaining and making offers and counteroffers.

For such a key industry, and one as sensitive as the telephone industry, collective bargaining has been a difficult and complex matter this year. The guidelines set forth by the President's Council of Economic Advisers established the figure of 3.2 percent for wage and fringe increases. The premise of the guidelines, however, was that they would be even-handed, applying equally both to wages and to prices, so that, to the extent that labor's wage increases conformed to the guidelines, labor would receive the benefits of a stable economy without inflationary increases in the cost of living. The absence of any coherent and successful Government policy protecting the value of labor's earned dollars, however, requires a new look at these guidelines; for, in many cases, prices have soared, yet labor is asked to accept the full burden of the guidelines while not receiving the benefits which they were intended to provide.

The sincere effort to make collective bargaining work has been manifest in the attitude of the parties so far. The union, for instance, ordered a vote among its members at Western Electric on the question of a strike. Meanwhile, even though the vote was called for, the union continued to talk with the company. Even after the strike vote showed a 7-to-1 majority, the officials of the CWA continued their efforts to come to an agreement with the company. These efforts are continuing right now.

Nor, for that matter, was the 3.2-percent figure intended to be an absolute ceiling on wage and fringe benefits everywhere. The leaders of CWA have argued, with firmness but with patience, that the guidelines were never intended to become a tightwire to which all increases, regardless of circumstances, must conform. Even the guidelines, as formulated by the Administration, provide for exceptions.

I do not mean to say that arguments based upon the guidelines are not a proper subject for the bargaining table. Indeed, I feel strongly that they are.

None of us wants runaway inflation, and I have little doubt that that is as true of the men at Western Electric in the CWA, and the Western Electric Co. itself, as it is of the rest of us. But it is difficult to believe that reasonable wage adjustments for highly skilled workmen and technicians within the confines of give and take in collective bargaining is likely to contribute very seriously to an inflationary picture.

I rather hope that the wages in this highly complex industry would not be allowed to cause an erosion of the manpower supply in those industries, with serious implications for our national ability to maintain a communications system operating at top efficiency in a period of national stress.

Let me express the expectation that the guidelines will be constantly before the parties, and also the expectation that they will find a way in which to resolve their differences so that we will not have reports in this field of grave problems arising which have just been surmounted in the airlines field.

I am therefore glad to report to the Senate that the CWA, who justifiably take pride in their reputation as a responsible community minded union, is continuing to negotiate with a responsible management like that at Western Electric.

We do not yet know where the negotiations are going, but I appreciate the spirit of responsibility which has been manifested by both sides.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) to authorize printing of additional hearings. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Aug. 17, 1966, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 19622.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on the Independent offices appropriation bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commission, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Aug. 18, 1966, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 19904–19905.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House, which will be stated by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 33, and 38 to the bill (H.R. 14921) entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the funds made available for the Labor Department building shall not be available for expenditure until the General Services Administration certifies to Congress that the relevant portion of the Inner Loop Freeway and the substructure of the Labor Department building are coordinated in design and will be constructed as a unit."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$8,759,000" named in said amendment, insert "$6,000,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the last proviso therein, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That this sum shall be derived by transfer from funds previously made available for grants for urban renewal."

Resolved, That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 to aforesaid bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 19, and 28.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we know what those amendments concern?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Amendment No. 17 is the amendment the conferees agreed upon to make the funds available for the substructure of the Labor Department building, with a proviso that funds shall not be available for expenditure until the General Services Administration certifies to Congress that the relevant portion of the Inner Loop Freeway and the substructure of the Labor Department building are coordinated in design and will be constructed as a unit.

Mr. President, amendment No. 19 changes the amount provided for court facilities which are required for the new judges who are named by the Congress. The budget figure presented was $8,759,000. The amendment agrees to $6 million.

Amendment No. 28 is on the fellowships, which were suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. The conference committee agreed to it with a proviso that "this sum shall be derived by transfer of funds previously made available for grants for urban renewal."

In other words, we took $500,000 off the urban renewal appropriation and added $500,000 within the appropriation for fellowships for the study of city planning and urban problems.

THE CLARK FELLOWSHIPS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Although this is a small amount in dollars, it can nevertheless have great significance for the country's urban centers, large and small.

For the first time the independent offices conference report makes provision for funds for the program of fellowships in city planning and urban studies authorized in the Housing Act of 1964. As a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I am keenly aware of the critical need for skilled personnel in the community development field. Without adequately trained professionals at the local level, our massive Federal programs in housing, mass transit, and urban renewal—to name but a few—can never achieve a full measure of success.

This program is designed to meet that need by establishing fellowships for graduate study in the fields of city and regional planning, housing, urban renewal and community development. Applicants will be selected on the basis of ability, and will study at various public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education having programs of graduate study in the field of city planning or in related fields, including architecture, civil engineering, municipal finance, and public administration.

I very much hope that the Department of Housing and Urban Development will see fit to honor my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] who, together with the chairman of the Housing subcommittee [Mr. SPARKMAN], had the imagination to have this program authorized in the Housing Act of 1964, and who has fought so tenaciously to secure an appropriation for it ever since, by designating it the Clark fellowship program. All of us know of the splendid work which the Fulbright fellows have done in increasing international understanding. We look forward to the important work which the Clark fellows will soon be doing in rebuilding our Nation's cities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I again move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 19, and 28.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 19, and 28.

The amendments were concurred in.

PROJECT MOHOLE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from amendment No. 26. That is the National Science Foundation Mohole project.

The action by the Congress in denying any additional funds for Project Mohole in effect terminates the project. I would expect that the National Science Foundation would close out the activities in this project in an orderly, expeditious and effective manner, with due regard for the best interests of the Government. The Foundation should exercise its best judgment in determining which contracts and subcontracts to terminate immediately and which should be completed because of the advanced progress of the work or value of the completed item to other projects or other agencies of Government.

It would seem reasonable, for example, that a subcontract for the design of a component or the fabrication of a system or subsystem should be allowed to be completed, if the work under the subcontract is already essentially completed and the item could have some utility. On the other hand, I would expect that the subcontract for the platform, which is just getting underway, would be terminated as quickly as possible.

The goal of the Foundation should be to close down the project as quickly as good business judgment dictates, conserving as much of the funds already appropriated as possible, and preserving for the Government to the greatest extent the benefit of the work already accomplished.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the action of the House of Representa-

tives in forcing a rejection of funds for Project Mohole is a blow to the advancement of science in this country. We can spend billions to shoot a man to the moon because there is romance and adventure in the idea of interplanetary travel, but because Project Mohole does not have the built-in advantage of the public relations efforts resulting from science-fiction movies, television shows, and paperback books, it is characterized by some, including those who should know better, as "just a hole."

Rejection of the $20 million budgeted for this project will have serious and unfortunate results. First, the Government will have spent some $85 million only to stop just short of its goal. This is a strange sort of economy.

Second, and more important in the long run, we will be forfeiting world leadership in exploration and exploitation of the deep-sea bottom. An editorial from the June 3, 1966, Science magazine, puts it very well. I read an excerpt:

On the surface, what is involved is a delay on a contract for a drilling platform. This would "save" about $20 million in fiscal 1967. In fact, what is involved is forfeiture of world leadership in exploration and exploitation of the deep-sea bottom. What is at stake are trillions of dollars worth of resources. We are aware of a tremendous resource of manganese nodules on the bottom. What is beneath the crust-ocean interface could be fabulous. It does not require much imagination to visualize exploitation by completely automated mining and concentrating operations on the sea bottom, with energy derived from underwater nuclear power stations.

Ostensibly the Mohole drilling platform is being constructed mainly to permit drilling to the Mohorivicic discontinuity, but the platform would create another exciting capability—the possibility of obtaining exploratory cores of the deep sea bottom generally. It would create an opportunity to evaluate economic potentials beneath the bottom and to explore a host of scientific questions concerning the history of the earth.

This is a sad day for our support of basic science. But it is also a blow at a project which offers tremendous material advantages to the Nation with the courage and foresight to attempt it. It would make new oil, gas, and other mineral resources accessible. It would advance our efforts in food resource and marine research, in offshore desalinization, and in our ability to measure sea forces, density, currents and temperature, and to forecast earthquakes.

Mr. President, with the exploration that the Soviet Russians are doing off their Siberian coast, and their drilling, they must be glad to see us cease our scientific exploration in this field.

Now all we have done will be lost.

I wish to commend the able chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MAGNUSON]. He is the greatest champion in the Senate of oceanographic research. He fought for the appropriation in the Senate and in conference, and it was only a recommital of the bill by the whole House that finally brought about the unfortunate situation we are faced with today. As one who had the privilege of serving 7 years on the Committee on Commerce under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Washington, I again express to him my commendation for his effort in leading the fight to assure the continuance of this project which, according to the American Geophysical Union, we may in the long run, be losing trillions instead of billions of dollars by stopping.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I regret that the project was deleted from the bill The RECORD should show that the cost to the Government of discontinuing it will be in excess of $36 million. In fact, practically everything that we have spent will have been wasted, and the Government and Nation will realize very little from this large expenditure.

I thought that we had finally established in the hearings a ceiling as to the cost of this project. That is important, because I and others had become very concerned with the large increases in the cost estimates. But good testimony was presented to the Appropriations Subcommittee, based on past experience, that the project could have been completed for a total cost of about $125 million.

Mr. President, I think the RECORD should also show that the conferees on the bill stuck to their guns, but the House was adamant in its own beliefs. We insisted that the problem be sent back to the House, where it was voted upon. It will be recalled that the House had not this year acted at all on the proposal. By our insistence, the House conferees brought the measure back to the House floor and it was voted upon. Unfortunately, the vote was against a continuation of the project.

I repeat, Mr. President, I regret that all the work that has been done up to now will go to no good end. As to whether or not any results of the development can be used in the future remains to be seen. I presume that in time to come, the project may be revived, and I express the hope that it will be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Texas. The Senator from Colorado has asked that I yield to him.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word or two, particularly while the Senator from Texas is on the floor, because I think he should not be proceeding under any misapprehension.

When the Senator from Louisiana said that the Senate conferees stuck fast, that statement was quite true. Every conferee on the conference committee, including myself, voted to uphold the Senate position, which finally, after several hours of argument—not a few minutes, but several hours—forced the House to make a decision one way or another, and they finally decided to insist on their position and take it back to the House; and the House of Representatives voted, as I recall it, somewhere in the neighborhood of 108 to 52—roughly 2 to 1—to uphold their committee.

There is some slight difference between my point of view and that of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who is a great friend of mine and whose judgment I always value.

If they have accomplished so far, on this project, what they claim to have accomplished, then we should have a very rich reward for the money we have spent. We have already appropriated $55 million. We have actually expended somewhere between $25 million and $30 million of that amount; and the total expenditure necessary to close out the project can well be in the neighborhood of $36 million. This ought to be a very cheap price. If all they have told us is true, then it will be a cheap price.

As a matter of fact, the National Science Foundation was never meant to handle a project of this kind. They are not equipped to do it, and I honestly think, in my own mind, Mr. President, that that is part of the reason why this particular project has become such a calamity.

They are talking now about $127 million. I have stated on the floor that by the time we started on the project and got to our first point of entry at the Mohorovicic Discontinuity, or the mantle, it would have cost more than $175 million. I have quoted just such figures throughout the 5 years I have watched this project. Some of my friends thought I had overstated the situation; actually, I have understated it every time I have spoken.

I should like to say a word or two about closing this project out, Mr. President, if I may. I think it will call for some good, hard sense. By way of legislative history, I should like to state that it is my view that in general, no further hardware should be fabricated, but studies which are underway, and which can be completed in a reasonable time—which, in fact, are almost concluded now—might be finished at relatively small cost.

There are certain subcontracts, which the National Science Foundation has furnished to me, that might be finished in terms of closing out the project in an orderly manner, and achieving the maximum returns for the dollars spent to date. I have not had a chance to discuss this matter personally with the managers of the project, so I shall not place those subcontracts in the RECORD at this time.

It seems to me, as a third point, that all of the information gained from the project should be published, so that the entire public may have available to it the maximum amount of knowledge resulting from the project, and our scientific people throughout the country may have an opportunity to look at all of the so-called great advancements and accomplishments that have been achieved in this area, to weigh their merits.

I consider also, as a fourth corollary, the ocean sediment coring program which will be 10 times more beneficial to this country than the Mohole project ever would have been. It will go forward expeditiously and the results of the pro-

gram of course will be useful in preparing later to drill deeper.

Mr. President, I say again to those who are interested that, although it was not my conviction, I did stay with the views of the Senate committee, as did every Senate member of the conference committee.

There was no dissent from those views. There are five members of the committee on the floor right now. I think the Senator from Texas should know that even though our views were different, we did uphold the position of the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when I extend my congratulations to the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, I did not intend to limit them to him at all. I assure the Senator from Colorado that, although his personal views are different from mine on some of this matter, I appreciate the fact that every member of the conference committee, on both sides of the aisle, supported the effort that was made to uphold the Senate position. The whole Senate stood in back of the scientific exploration.

We spend approximately $5 billion a year for exploration in space. Some scientists tell me that we know less about what is contained in the earth's mantle, than we do about what is in outer space. We could gain much knowledge from an exploration of this question.

We have explored space by the telescope for a long time. We have also explored space through electronic means. However, we do not know much about the earth's mantle nor about how long that mantle has been there and what its composition is. Many things are involved. I will not go into that now. However, the important parts of that subject will be gone into at some future time.

In the meantime, we have lost the leadership in this great scientific field of exploration under the water to others.

The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] knows better than anyone else that the Soviet Union has explored so much more of the ocean floor than we have. They are ahead of us in oceanography and now we are letting them get further ahead.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. What the Senator from Colorado has said is correct. Regardless of whether the Senate conferees had voted for or against the Mohole project, they stuck to the views of the Senate in conference.

As chairman of the conference committee, I deeply appreciate their standing with the Senate on this matter.

I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish simply to confirm that, as the Senator from Colorado has said, the Senate conferees stood together on this subject, as we did on all other subjects. We acted unanimously and left it to the House Members to decide on this subject. They would not agree to any compromise on the Mohole project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I very much regret the failure of the conference committee to support Project Mohole.

However, I fully understand the position of the chairman of the Senate conference committee, who valiantly against great opposition fought for this project and was forced to give his assurance to House conferees that if the Project Mohole authorization request was turned down by a vote of the full House, Senate conferees would recommend that the Senate recede from its support of the Mohole project.

I still maintain that this is a vitally important scientific program which I do not believe this Nation can afford to permit to be halted at this time. I am hopeful that the administration will be able to breathe new life into Project Mohole by including it in the supplemental appropriations request.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am keenly disappointed that Project Mohole must be terminated. The termination is particularly regrettable because it was not the action of the Senate, but the decision of the other body, that is causing the abandonment of the project.

I wish to express my appreciation to all my colleagues in this body who supported the funds requested to continue Project Mohole. By their favorable vote, they demonstrated their belief and conviction that the Mohole program is a meritorious and needed scientific project.

My appreciation goes, too, to the Senate conferees who upheld the position of the Senate in conference. I commend them for devoting as much time and energy as they did in their unsuccessful attempt to persuade the conferees of the House to relent from their opposition to the project.

Looking to the future, it is difficult for me to believe that Project Mohole will be abandoned for too long. It is a venture that this country will feel impelled to revive out of the necessity of exploring new frontiers of knowledge. For Project Mohole has indeed been properly called "the most significant single scientific experiment of the century in earth science."

When the economic circumstances are more favorable, I expect that we will see Project Mohole come to life again as a necessary and vital project for our national interest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation of the action taken on the bill.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967 (H.R. 14921)

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1966 and the estimates and action taken on items in the bill for 1967

Item	Appropriations, 1966 (adjusted) [1]	Budget estimates, 1967 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I								
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT								
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL								
Salaries and expenses	$525,000	$525,000	$525,000	$525,000	$525,000			
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING								
Salaries and expenses	4,869,000	5,096,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	−$396,000		
Salaries and expenses, telecommunications	1,280,000	2,270,000	1,500,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	−670,000	+$100,000	
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies	4,451,000	4,821,000	4,450,000	3,500,000	4,000,000	−821,000	−450,000	+$500,000
Total, Office of Emergency Planning	10,600,000	12,187,000	10,650,000	9,800,000	10,300,000	−1,887,000	−350,000	+500,000
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY								
Salaries and expenses	1,070,000	1,360,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	−160,000		
Total, Executive Office of the President	12,195,000	14,072,000	12,375,000	11,525,000	12,025,000	−2,047,000	−350,000	+500,000

See footnotes at end of table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967 (H.R. 14921)—Continued

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1966 and the estimates and action taken on items in the bill for 1967—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1966 (adjusted) [1]	Budget estimates, 1967 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with— Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—Continued								
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT								
Disaster relief	$120,000,000	$15,000,000	$15,000,000	$15,000,000	$15,000,000			
INDEPENDENT OFFICES								
APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	[2] *(1,128,000)*	1,110,000	1,000,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	−$10,000	+$100,000	
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD								
Salaries and expenses	11,162,750	12,222,291	11,600,000	12,100,000	12,000,000	−222,291	+400,000	−100,000
Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization)	81,170,000	67,000,000	63,500,000	63,500,000	63,500,000	−3,500,000		
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board	92,332,750	79,222,291	75,100,000	75,600,000	75,500,000	−3,722,291	+400,000	−100,000
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation	25,028,000	[3] 23,665,000	21,400,000	23,400,000	22,400,000	−1,265,000	+1,000,000	−1,000,000
By transfer from trust funds		*(6,160,000)*	*(6,100,000)*	*(6,100,000)*	*(6,100,000)*	*(−60,000)*		
Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations	585,000	642,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	−42,000		
Annuities under special acts	1,550,000	1,455,000	1,430,000	1,430,000	1,430,000	−25,000		
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits	29,220,000	31,730,000	31,730,000	31,730,000	31,730,000			
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund	67,000,000	73,000,000	73,000,000	73,000,000	73,000,000			
Administrative expenses, employees life insurance fund (limitation)	*(285,200)*							
Total, Civil Service Commission	123,383,000	130,492,000	128,160,000	130,160,000	129,160,000	−1,332,000	+1,000,000	−1,000,000
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY								
Operations	555,039,000	561,500,000	558,000,000	560,000,000	559,000,000	−2,500,000	+1,000,000	−1,000,000
Facilities and equipment	49,800,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	28,000,000			
Research and development	37,500,000	30,000,000	27,500,000	30,000,000	28,500,000	−1,500,000	+1,000,000	−1,500,000
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport	3,731,500	3,779,000	3,731,500	3,731,500	3,731,500	−47,500		
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport	4,590,000	4,707,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	−107,000		
Construction, Washington National Airport	1,050,000							
Construction, Dulles International Airport	200,000	Language	Language	Language	Language			
Grants-in-aid for airports (fiscal year 1967)	71,000,000	Language				−Language		
Civil supersonic aircraft development	140,000,000	[4] 280,000,000	280,000,000	280,000,000	280,000,000			
Total, Federal Avaition Agency	862,910,500	907,986,000	901,831,500	906,331,500	903,831,500	−4,154,500	+2,000,000	−2,500,000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	17,338,500	17,520,000	17,338,500	17,338,500	17,338,500	−181,500		
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	13,530,000	14,288,000	13,650,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	−288,000	+350,000	
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	13,862,500	14,009,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	−9,000		
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE								
Salaries and expenses	47,435,000	48,800,000	48,500,000	48,500,000	48,500,000	−300,000		
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION								
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	231,350,000	241,015,000	239,000,000	240,000,000	240,000,000	−1,015,000	+1,000,000	
Repair and improvement of public buildings	87,500,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000			
Construction, public buildings projects	133,603,000	170,277,000	101,565,000	115,230,000	113,998,000	−56,279,000	+12,433,000	−1,232,000
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	19,530,250	12,786,000	11,694,000	15,224,000	14,132,000	+1,346,000	+2,438,000	−1,092,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	3,380,000	6,746,000	6,746,000	6,746,000	6,746,000			
Additional court facilities		[5] 8,759,000		8,759,000	6,000,000	−2,759,000	+6,000,000	−2,759,000
Expenses, U.S. court facilities	1,560,000	1,849,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	−349,000		
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	59,796,000	60,306,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	−306,000		
Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	*(9,477,000)*	*(9,346,000)*	*(9,000,000)*	*(9,000,000)*	*(9,000,000)*	*(−346,000)*		
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	16,268,000	16,979,000	16,800,000	16,800,000	16,800,000	−179,000		
National historical publication grants	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000			
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service	5,709,000	6,192,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	−292,000		
Strategic and critical materials (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	*(17,400,000)*	*(19,847,000)*	*(18,800,000)*	*(19,847,000)*	*(19,847,000)*		*(+1,047,000)*	
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	1,650,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000			
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000			
Salaries and expenses, automatic data processing coordination	200,000	672,000	500,000	600,000	500,000	−172,000		−100,000
Administrative operations fund (limitation)	*(15,958,000)*	*(16,994,000)*	*(16,050,000)*	*(16,050,000)*	*(16,050,000)*	*(−44,000)*		
Working capital fund	100,000	200,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	−100,000		
Total, General Services Administration	561,231,250	608,066,000	526,090,000	553,144,000	547,961,000	−60,105,000	+21,871,000	−5,183,000

See footnotes at end of table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967 (H.R. 14921)—Continued

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1966 and the estimates and action taken on items in the bill for 1967—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1966 (adjusted) [1]	Budget estimates, 1967 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with— Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—Continued								
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Con.								
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	$27,540,000	$27,759,000	$27,759,000	$27,759,000	$27,759,000			
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION								
Authorization								
Research and development $4,248,600,000	4,531,000,000	4,246,600,000	4,245,000,000	4,246,600,000	4,245,000,000	−$1,600,000		−$1,600,000
Construction of facilities 95,919,000	60,000,000	101,500,000	75,000,000	95,000,000	83,000,000	−18,500,000	+$8,000,000	−12,000,000
Administrative operations 655,900,000	584,000,000	663,900,000	630,000,000	650,000,000	640,000,000	−23,900,000	+10,000,000	−10,000,000
5,000,419,000								
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	5,175,000,000	5,012,000,000	4,950,000,000	4,991,600,000	4,968,000,000	−44,000,000	+18,000,000	−23,600,000
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY								
Operation and maintenance of properties	49,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000			
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION								
Salaries and expenses	479,999,000	525,000,000	479,999,000	499,699,000	479,999,000	−45,001,000		−19,700,000
Excess foreign currency authorization		Language				Language		
RENEGOTIATION BOARD								
Salaries and expenses	2,530,000	2,477,000	2,477,000	2,477,000	2,477,000			
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	16,442,000	17,550,000	17,250,000	17,250,000	17,250,000	−300,000		
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM								
Salaries and expenses	61,250,000	51,940,000	51,940,000	51,940,000	51,940,000			
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION								
General operating expenses	162,238,000	159,330,000	159,330,000	159,330,000	159,330,000			
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	13,496,000	14,217,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	−217,000		
Medical and prosthetic research	41,258,000	43,629,000	43,629,000	43,629,000	43,629,000			
Medical care	1,209,412,000	1,265,437,000	1,265,437,000	1,265,437,000	1,265,437,000			
Compensation and pensions	4,430,000,000	4,374,000,000	4,374,000,000	4,374,000,000	4,374,000,000			
Readjustment benefits	41,500,000	42,400,000	42,400,000	42,400,000	42,400,000			
Veterans insurance and indemnities	9,900,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000			
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	90,511,600	52,125,000	52,125,000	52,125,000	52,125,000			
Grants for construction of State nursing homes	2,500,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000			
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	386,000	386,000	386,000	386,000	386,000			
Direct loan revolving fund	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)			
Loan guaranty revolving fund (limitation on obligations)	*(380,000,000)*	Language	*(375,000,000)*	*(375,000,000)*	*(375,000,000)*	*(+375,000,000)*		
Loan guaranty revolving fund (transfer from direct loan revolving fund)	*(210,000,000)*	Language	*(200,000,000)*	*(200,000,000)*	*(200,000,000)*	*(+200,000,000)*		
Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief	25,000							
Total, Veterans' Administration	6,001,226,600	5,959,024,000	5,958,807,000	5,958,807,000	5,958,807,000	−217,000		
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE								
CIVIL DEFENSE								
Operation and maintenance:								
Appropriation	64,080,000	76,100,000	66,100,000	66,100,000	66,100,000	−10,000,000		
By transfer		*(1,000,000)*	*(1,000,000)*	*(1,000,000)*	*(1,000,000)*			
Research, shelter survey and marking	42,700,000	57,300,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	−22,300,000		
Total, civil defense, Department of Defense	106,780,000	133,400,000	101,100,000	101,100,000	101,100,000	−32,300,000		
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE								
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE								
Emergency health activities	[2] *(9,788,400)*	10,430,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	−430,000		
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT								
PLANNING AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES								
Urban planning grants	26,837,000	35,000,000	30,000,000	33,500,000	33,000,000	−2,000,000	+3,000,000	−500,000
Public works planning fund	15,000,000							
Low income housing demonstration programs	1,275,000	2,575,000	2,575,000	1,575,000	1,575,000	−1,000,000	−1,000,000	
Housing and building codes, zoning, tax policies, and development studies		3,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	−1,500,000		
Urban studies and housing research	750,000	750,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	−250,000		
Fellowships for city planning and urban studies				*(500,000)*	*(500,000)*	*(+500,000)*	*(+500,000)*	
Community development training programs		5,150,000				−5,150,000		
Natural disaster study	1,000,000	600,000		300,000		−600,000		−300,000
Total, planning and research activities	44,862,000	47,075,000	34,575,000	37,375,000	36,575,000	−10,500,000	+2,000,000	−800,000

See footnotes at end of table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967 (H.R. 14921)—Continued

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1966 and the estimates and action taken on items in the bill for 1967—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1966 (adjusted) [1]	Budget estimates, 1967 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with— Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—Continued								
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—Con.								
URBAN AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS								
Urban renewal programs:								
Grants, fiscal year 1966	$769,500,000							
Grants, fiscal year 1967	725,000,000							
Liquidation of contract authorization	331,000,000							
Administrative expenses	13,745,000	$15,625,000	$14,800,000	$15,373,000	$15,000,000	−$625,000	+$200,000	−$373,000
Urban transportation activities:								
Urban mass transportation grants, fiscal year 1966	130,000,000							
Urban mass transportation grants, fiscal year 1967	130,000,000							
Urban mass transportation grants, fiscal year 1968		[7] 55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000			
Urban mass transportation loans	5,000,000							
Administrative expenses, urban transportation activities	455,000	640,000	640,000	640,000	640,000			
Grants for neighborhood facilities	12,000,000	25,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	−8,000,000		
Open space land grants and urban beautification	49,475,000	85,935,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	−30,935,000		
Grants to aid advance acquisition of land	5,000,000	5,000,000				−5,000,000		
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000			
Rehabilitation loan fund	41,362,500	1,600,000	1,370,000	1,370,000	1,370,000	−230,000		
Total, urban and community development activities	2,312,537,500	288,800,000	243,810,000	244,383,000	244,010,000	−44,790,000	+200,000	−373,000
HOUSING ACTIVITIES								
Rent supplement program:								
Annual contract authorization	*(12,000,000)*	*(35,000,000)*	*(20,000,000)*	*(20,000,000)*	*(20,000,000)*	*(−15,000,000)*		
Appropriation for rent payments	100,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	−1,000,000		
Administrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration	450,000	1,030,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	−130,000		
Public housing programs:								
Annual contributions	220,000,000	260,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	−10,000,000		
Administrative expenses	17,405,000	20,223,000	18,800,000	18,800,000	18,800,000	−1,423,000		
Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund	50,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000			
Total, housing activities	287,955,000	364,253,000	351,700,000	351,700,000	351,700,000	−12,553,000		
PARTICIPATION SALES								
Federal National Mortgage Association								
Authorizations, with limitations		[8] Language		Language	Language		Language	
Payment of insufficiencies (indefinite)		[8] Language		Language	Language		Language	
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY								
Salaries and expenses	5,853,700	9,785,000	7,000,000	8,359,000	8,359,000	−1,426,000	+1,359,000	
Office building equipment and furnishings:								
Appropriation		575,000		575,000	575,000		+575,000	
By transfer		*(125,000)*		*(125,000)*	*(125,000)*		*(+125,000)*	
Total, Office of the Secretary	5,853,700	10,360,000	7,000,000	8,934,000	8,934,000	−1,426,000	+1,934,000	
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	2,651,208,200	710,488,000	637,085,000	642,392,000	641,219,000	−69,269,000	+4,134,000	−1,173,000
Total, definite appropriations	16,386,243,300	14,300,670,291	13,989,499,000	14,089,760,000	14,037,004,000	−263,666,291	+47,505,000	−52,756,000
Total, indefinite appropriation of receipts (proceeds of sales)	26,877,000	29,193,000	27,800,000	28,847,000	28,847,000	−346,000	+1,047,000	
Total appropriations, title I	16,413,120,300	14,329,863,291	14,017,299,000	14,118,607,000	14,065,851,000	264,012,291	+48,552,000	−52,756,000

[1] Includes amounts contained in the 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1966.
[2] Obligation of prior year funds brought forward.
[3] Including $1,493,000 contained in S. Doc. 93.
[4] Includes $200,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 416.
[5] Contained in H. Doc. 430.
[6] Language to reduce new obligational authority by $100,000,000.
[7] Excludes $95,000,000 not considered due to lack of legislative authorization.
[8] Contained in S. Doc. 92.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967 (H.R. 14921)

Corporations—Comparative statement of appropriations for 1966 and the estimates and action taken on items in the bill for 1967

ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitation on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Appropriations, 1966 (adjusted) [1]	Budget estimates, 1967 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:								
Administrative expenses	($3,960,000)	($4,410,000)	($4,410,000)	($4,410,000)	($4,410,000)			
Nonadministrative expenses	(13,155,000)	(13,465,000)	(13,465,000)	(13,465,000)	(13,465,000)			
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	(239,000)	(285,000)	(285,000)	(285,000)	(285,000)			
Department of Housing and Urban Development:								
College housing loans	(1,975,000)	(2,035,000)	(2,035,000)	(2,035,000)	(2,035,000)			
Public facility loans	(1,270,000)	(1,175,000)	(1,175,000)	(1,175,000)	(1,175,000)			
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)			
Housing for the elderly or handicapped	(1,075,000)	(1,215,000)	(1,100,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(−$15,000)	(+$100,000)	
Federal National Mortgage Association	(8,800,000)	(9,100,000)	(9,081,000)	(9,081,000)	(9,081,000)	(−19,000)		
Federal Housing Administration:								
Administrative expenses	(10,330,300)	(10,950,000)	(10,500,000)	(10,500,000)	(10,500,000)	(−450,000)		
Nonadministrative expenses	(81,850,000)	(89,400,000)	(85,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(−4,400,000)		
Public Housing Administration:								
Administrative expenses	(17,405,000)	(20,223,000)	(18,800,000)	(18,800,000)	(18,800,000)	(−1,423,000)		
Nonadministrative expenses	(1,200,000)	(1,273,000)	(1,123,000)	(1,123,000)	(1,123,000)	(−150,000)		
Total, administrative expenses	(141,369,300)	(153,641,000)	(147,084,000)	(147,184,000)	(147,184,000)	(−6,457,000)	(+100,000)	

[1] Includes pay supplemental, 1966.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3005) to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce accidents involving motor vehicles and to reduce the deaths and injuries occurring in such accidents, disagreed to by the Senate, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. YOUNGER, and Mr. DEVINE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13298) to amend the Organic Act of Guam in order to authorize the legislature thereof to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 25 and 31 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3034) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall not report on the details of the conference agreement. It was agreed to unanimously and was signed by all of the conferees of both Houses.

The full text of the conference report and the statement of the managers on the part of the House appear in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD beginning on page 20366.

I am pleased to report that final agreement reached upon the 54 separate amendments which embodied numerous individual projects and activities was arrived at in one long session of the conference committee.

Mr. President, the number of 54 separate amendments might be misleading because some of them involved as many as 2 or 3 dozen separate projects on which there were differences between the Senate and House action.

At this time I wish to pay my respects to all of the members of the conference committee. Present in the Chamber is the ranking minority member of the Senate conferees, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] who with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] represented the minority Members of the Senate. The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and I as chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee represented the majority for the Senate conferees.

Mr. President, I am grateful to report that all five Senate conferees were present for the entire conference. This is most unusual, and I am proud and happy to report that fact to the Senate.

The conference bill totals $6,994,590,150. This is $613,141,650 over the 1966 appropriation, $69,753,150 under the Senate bill, $28,347,850 under the estimates, and $118,563,150 over the House bill.

The net increase over the 1966 appropriation is largely due to an increase in the reimbursement appropriation to the Commodity Credit Corporation to repair the capital structure of the Corporation for losses incurred in prior years. The conference bill provides $3,855 million for this purpose. This is the amount requested in the budget estimate. Except for the losses incurred in fiscal year 1966, the only outstanding amount not reimbursed is the balance from fiscal 1961 in the amount of $1,057 million. It is expected that the budget estimate for fiscal 1968 will include this amount in addition to the full loss incurred in fiscal 1966, so the status of the Corporation will be brought up to date as intended by Public Law 87–155, approved August 17, 1961, which authorizes reimbursement appropriations for repair of CCC capital structure for losses incurred in the conduct of authorized programs.

I am particularly happy to report the progress made on this matter, because the Senate committee has been actively insistent for several years upon bringing the fiscal condition of the Commodity Credit Corporation to a more current basis, so that citizens generally may know more about the operation of this Corporation, and so that the Corporation reports will correctly reflect its operations.

The conference committee agreed to the Senate position in regard to the proposed misuse of funds by transfer from section 32, as proposed in the budget estimates, for funding the food stamp program for 1967.

The record is abundantly clear that the food stamp program is considered to be and is classified as a welfare activity, and not as a part of the agricultural price support or related program activities. In spite of this fact, the budget for fiscal 1967 proposed that the expenses for administration of the food stamp program in the amount of $150 million be financed by transfer from section 32. The Senate did not approve this abuse of the use of section 32 and appropriated a total of $140 million for the expenses of the food stamp program. This is twice as much as the Department was able to spend in fiscal 1966. The appropriation, as passed by the Senate for this activity, was comprised of $110 million by appropriation from general revenue funds and $30 million reappropriation of unexpended funds. I am pleased to report that the conference committee agreed with the Senate view in this regard and sincerely hope that the budget estimate for ensuing fiscal years will be in accordance with subsection 16(d) of the Food Stamp Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this section from the act be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the section of the act was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amounts expended under the authority of this Act shall not be considered amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the agricultural price-support program and appropriations for the purposes of this Act shall be considered, for the purpose of budget presentations, to relate to the functions of the Government concerned with welfare.

Mr. HOLLAND. Similarly, it is expected that in future years the expenses of the special milk program will be presented to the Congress as a regular appropriation, accordance with the provisions of Public Law 88–573, approved September 2, 1964. That act provided that the financing of the expenses of the special milk program would be in accordance with the basic legislation which authorized regular appropriation rather than the use of funds available by transfer from section 32.

Mr. President, the conference report, as printed in the RECORD beginning on page 20366 contains considerable detail in regard to each of the many items therein and of interest to Members of the Senate. In addition, I intend to offer for the RECORD a comparative table of appropriations which shows the figures for each appropriation item as it progressed through the Congress.

Unless Senators have questions, I now yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from North Dakota, the ranking minority member of the committee, who has been so indispensable in the development of this bill and in all stages of its passage to this point.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator from Florida for his very gracious comments.

This was not an easy bill to handle. I have been the ranking Republican member of this committee for about 18 years. Some years ago—it seems like a long while ago—when the Republicans were in control of the Senate, I was chairman of this committee for about 2 years.

I believe this bill handled exceedingly well by its chairman, the distinguished Senator from Florida, took the shortest amount of time in conference this year than in any other year I have served on this committee.

There was the finest kind of cooperation between the staff members and all the conferees. The Senator from Florida has well stated that all the conferees signed this report and fully approved it.

With the difficult handicap of severe Bureau of the Budget cuts, we were able to restore those deep cuts in important programs, such as the special school milk program, the school lunch program, agricultural research, and many other programs and we were still able to come out with a budget of some $28 million under the budget estimate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope that the Senator will add to his list, which has been so accurately stated, the Agricultural Extension Service, which we also restored to a more adequate condition in spite of heavy budgetary limitations.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am sure that the Senator from Florida will insert all these figures in the RECORD. I think it is in the table.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, unless there are questions from Members, I now move that the conference report be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I now have, for submission in the RECORD, the compilation showing the various items in this very large bill, by way of contrast between budget amounts, House action, Senate action, and conference action, and compared with appropriations for last year, 1966. I ask that the compilation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1966 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1967

Item	Appropriations, 1966 (adjusted)[1]	Budget estimates, 1967	House bill, 1967	Senate bill, 1967	Conference allowance, 1967	Conference bill (+) or (−)—		
						Budget estimates, 1967	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL ACTIVITIES								
Agricultural Research Service:								
Salaries and expenses:								
Research	[2] $125,959,000	[2] $107,980,000	[2] $120,673,000	[2] $123,844,600	[2] $123,402,500	+$15,422,500	+$2,729,500	−$442,100
Plant and animal disease and pest control	75,547,000	69,748,000	76,764,000	81,493,200	80,263,900	+10,515,900	+3,499,900	−1,243,300
Subtotal	[3] 201,506,000	[3] 177,728,000	[3] 197,437,000	[3] 205,342,800	[3] 203,666,400	+25,938,400	+6,229,400	−1,676,900
Special foreign currency research program	3,000,000	(4)	3,000,000	6,000,000	4,500,000	+4,500,000	+1,500,000	−1,500,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	204,506,000	177,728,000	200,437,000	211,342,800	208,166,400	+30,438,400	+7,729,400	−3,176,400
Cooperative State Research Service:								
Payments and expenses	[5] 54,827,000	47,740,000	55,227,000	60,740,000	58,740,000	+11,000,000	+3,513,000	−2,000,000
Extension Service:								
Payments to States and Puerto Rico	75,600,000	75,917,500	75,917,500	78,917,500	78,917,500	+3,000,000	+3,000,000	
Retirement costs for extension agents	7,857,000	8,139,500	8,139,500	8,139,500	8,139,500			
Penalty mail	3,113,000	3,113,000	3,113,000	3,113,000	3,113,000			
Federal Extension Service	2,565,000	3,054,000	2,654,000	2,654,000	2,654,000	−400,000		
Total, Extension Service	89,135,000	90,224,000	89,824,000	92,824,000	92,824,000	+2,600,000	+3,000,000	
Farmer Cooperative Service	1,167,000	1,175,000	1,175,000	1,175,000	1,175,000			

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1966 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1967—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1966 (adjusted)[1]	Budget estimates, 1967	House bill, 1967	Senate bill, 1967	Conference allowance, 1967	Conference bill (+) or (−)— Budget estimates, 1967	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL ACTIVITIES—con.								
Soil Conservation Service:								
Conservation operations	$108,802,000	$109,020,000	$109,235,000	$109,235,000	$109,235,000	$+215,000		
Watershed planning	5,853,000	6,397,000	6,142,000	6,142,000	6,142,000	−255,000		
Watershed protection	66,331,000	66,559,000	67,020,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	+3,441,000	+$2,980,000	
Flood prevention	25,571,000	25,654,000	25,654,000	25,654,000	25,654,000			
Great Plains conservation program	16,082,000	16,112,000	16,112,000	18,500,000	18,500,000	+2,388,000	+2,388,000	
Resource conservation and development	4,347,000	4,574,000	4,347,000	4,574,000	4,574,000		+227,000	
Total, Soil Conservation Service	226,986,000	228,316,000	228,510,000	234,105,000	234,105,000	+5,789,000	+5,595,000	
Economic Research Service:								
Salaries and expenses	11,782,000	12,547,000	12,032,000	12,182,000	12,132,000	−415,000	+100,000	−$50,000
Statistical Reporting Service:								
Salaries and expenses	14,067,000	13,434,000	13,272,000	13,575,000	13,511,750	+77,750	+239,750	−63,250
Consumer and Marketing Service:								
Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs	77,654,000	[6] 83,961,000	82,757,000	83,881,000	83,881,000	−80,000	+1,124,000	
Payments to States and possessions	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000			
Special milk program	103,000,000	21,000,000	[7] 50,000,000	[7] 105,000,000	[7] 51,000,000	+30,000,000	+1,000,000	−54,000,000
School lunch program	[8] 157,000,000	[8] 138,000,000	[8] 157,000,000	[8] 169,500,000	[8] 165,855,000	+27,855,000	+8,855,000	−3,645,000
Food stamp program	[9] 79,992,000	(10)	(10)	[10] 110,000,000	[10] 110,000,000	+110,000,000	+110,000,000	
Total, Consumer and Marketing Service	419,396,000	244,711,000	291,507,000	470,131,000	412,486,000	+167,775,000	+120,979,000	−57,645,000
Foreign Agricultural Service:								
Salaries and expenses	[11] 20,752,000	[11] 21,379,000	[11] 21,088,000	[11] 21,349,000	[11] 21,218,500	−160,500	+130,500	−130,500
Commodity Exchange Authority	1,197,000	1,398,000	1,398,000	1,398,000	1,398,000			
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:								
Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:								
By appropriation	[12] 126,278,500	[13] 135,891,000	[13] 128,558,000	[13] 130,424,500	[13] 128,558,000	−7,333,000		−1,866,500
Sugar Act program	95,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000			
Agricultural conservation program	220,000,000	220,000,000	220,000,000	220,000,000	220,000,000			
Appalachian region conservation program		4,375,000	2,200,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	−1,375,000	+800,000	
Cropland conversion program	7,500,000	10,000,000	7,500,000	10,000,000	7,500,000	−2,500,000		−2,500,000
Cropland adjustment program		200,000,000	90,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	−150,000,000	−40,000,000	
Conservation reserve program	146,000,000	143,000,000	140,000,000	140,000,000	140,000,000	−3,000,000		
Emergency conservation measures	24,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000			
Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	618,778,500	798,266,000	673,258,000	638,424,500	634,058,000	−164,208,000	−39,200,000	−4,366,500
Rural Community Development Service	637,000	3,468,000	637,000	2,500,000	637,000	−2,831,000		−1,863,000
Office of Inspector General	10,613,000	11,602,000	11,254,000	11,254,000	11,254,000	−348,000		
Packers and Stockyards Act	2,400,000	2,604,000	2,400,000	2,604,000	2,502,000	−102,000	+102,000	−102,000
Office of General Counsel	4,286,000	4,325,000	4,325,000	4,325,000	4,325,000			
Office of Information	1,915,000	1,826,000	1,826,000	1,851,000	1,851,000	+25,000	+25,000	
National Agricultural Library:								
Salaries and expenses	1,735,000	2,501,000	2,147,000	2,501,000	2,412,500	−88,500	+265,500	−88,500
Library facilities	7,000,000							
Office Management Services	2,542,000	2,687,000	2,600,000	2,609,000	2,600,000	−87,000		
General administration	3,928,000	3,959,000	3,959,000	3,959,000	3,959,000			
Total, title I, general activities	1,697,649,500	1,669,890,000	1,616,876,000	1,188,840,300	1,719,355,150	+49,465,150	+102,479,150	−69,485,150
TITLE II—CREDIT AGENCIES								
Rural Electrification Administration:								
Loan authorizations:								
Electrification	[14] (365,000,000)	(220,000,000)	[15] (365,000,000)	[15] (375,000,000)	[16] (375,000,000)	(+155,000,000)	(+10,000,000)	
Telephone	[16] (97,000,000)	(85,000,000)	[17] (97,000,000)	[17] (117,000,000)	[17] (117,000,000)	(+32,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	
Total, loan authorizations	(462,000,000)	(305,000,000)	(462,000,000)	(492,000,000)	(492,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+30,000,000)	
Salaries and expenses	12,202,000	12,202,000	12,202,000	12,302,000	12,202,000			−100,000
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	12,202,000	12,202,000	12,202,000	12,302,000	12,202,000			−100,000
Farmers Home Administration:								
Direct loan account:								
Real estate loans	(75,000,000)	[18] (97,100,000)	(90,000,000)	(90,000,000)	(90,000,000)	(−7,100,000)		
Operating loans	[19] (300,000,000)	[19] (300,000,000)	[19] (300,000,000)	[19] (350,000,000)	[19] (350,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	
Total, direct loan account	(375,000,000)	(397,100,000)	(390,000,000)	(440,000,000)	(440,000,000)	(+42,900,000)	(+50,000,000)	
Rural water and waste disposal grants	20,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000			
Rural housing direct loan account	2,500,000	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)			
Rural housing insurance fund	100,000,000							
Rural housing grants		4,000,000				−4,000,000		
Rural housing for domestic farm labor	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000			
Rural renewal	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000			
Salaries and expenses	[21] 49,661,000	51,600,000	[21] 51,057,000	[21] 51,000,000	[21] 51,057,000	(−543,000)		(+57,000)
Total, Farmers Home Administration	176,361,000	85,800,000	81,257,000	81,200,000	81,257,000	−4,543,000		+57,000
Total, title II, credit agencies:								
Loan authorizations	(837,000,000)	(702,100,000)	(852,000,000)	(932,000,000)	932,000,000	(+229,900,000)	(80,000,000)	
Direct appropriation	188,563,000	98,002,000	93,459,000	93,502,000	93,459,000	−4,543,000		−43,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1966 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1967—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1966 (adjusted)[1]	Budget estimates, 1967	House bill, 1967	Senate bill, 1967	Conference allowance, 1967	Conference bill (+) or (−)— Budget estimates, 1967	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE III—CORPORATIONS								
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:								
Administrative and operating expenses:								
Appropriation	$8,192,000	$8,546,000	$8,342,000	$8,546,000	$8,446,000	−$100,000	+$104,000	−$100,000
Premium income	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,150,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,100,000)	(+100,000)	(−50,000)	(+100,000)
Commodity Credit Corporation:								
Reimbursement for net realized losses	2,800,000,000	3,555,855,000	3,500,000,000	3,555,855,000	3,555,855,000		+55,855,000	
Limitation on administrative expenses	(36,650,000)	(34,300,000)	(34,300,000)	(34,300,000)	(34,300,000)			
Public Law 480	1,658,000,000	1,617,000,000	1,617,000,000	1,617,000,000	1,617,000,000			
International Wheat Agreement	27,544,000	60,000,000	40,000,000			−60,000,000	−40,000,000	
Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile		13,000,000				−13,000,000		
Total, title III, corporations	4,493,736,000	5,254,401,000	5,165,342,000	5,181,401,000	5,181,301,000	−73,100,000	+15,959,000	−100,000
TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES								
Farm Credit Administration:								
Limitation on administrative expenses	(3,018,000)	(3,032,000)	(3,032,000)	(3,032,000)	(3,032,000)			
National Commission on Food Marketing	1,500,000							
National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber		645,000	350,000	600,000	475,000	−170,000	+125,000	−125,000
Total, title IV, related agencies	1,500,000	645,000	350,000	600,000	475,000	−170,000	+125,000	−125,000
Total appropriations:								
Title I—General activities	1,697,649,500	1,669,890,000	1,616,876,000	1,788,840,300	1,719,355,150	+49,465,150	+102,479,150	−69,485,150
Title II—Credit agencies	188,563,000	98,002,000	93,459,000	93,502,000	93,459,000	−4,543,000		−43,000
Title III—Corporations	4,493,736,000	5,254,401,000	5,165,342,000	5,181,401,000	5,181,301,000	−73,100,000	+15,959,000	−100,000
Title IV—Related agencies	1,500,000	645,000	350,000	600,000	475,000	−170,000	+125,000	−125,000
Grand total	6,381,448,500	7,022,938,000	6,876,027,000	7,064,343,300	6,994,590,150	−28,347,850	+118,563,150	−69,753,150

[1] Includes pay supplemental, 1966.
[2] In addition, a transfer and merger of $18,100,000 from sec. 32 funds was authorized in 1966. Transfer of $25,000,000 from sec. 32 funds requested and approved for 1967. Conference limited future budgets estimates for transfers from sec. 32 to $15,000,000.
[3] In addition, reappropriation of $2,000,000 proposed and approved for special fund.
[4] Proposed deletion of dollar appropriation and insertion of language to authorize use of specific foreign currencies ($23,788,000 equivalent).
[5] In addition, $400,000 transferred from sec. 32 funds.
[6] Amended by S. Doc. 98 in the amount of $300,000 for expenses of Public Law 89-502, approved July 13, 1966.
[7] In addition, $53,000,000 transfer from sec. 32 funds authorized by House, but changed to direct appropriation by the Senate and the conference-adopted House provision.
[8] In addition, $45,000,000 transfer from sec. 32 funds provided.
[9] In addition, a reappropriation of $20,000,000 of prior year funds authorized.
[10] 1967 budget proposal to transfer $150,000,000 from sec. 32 funds approved by House and changed by Senate and adopted by conference to $110,000,000 direct appropriation, plus $30,000,000 reappropiration.
[11] In addition, transfer of $3,117,000 from sec. 32 funds requested and approved.
[12] In addition, transfer of $87,495,000 from CCC fund authorized.
[13] In addition, transfer of $77,545,000 from CCC fund requested in budget and $75,803,600 approved by House and increased to $77,545,000 by Senate. Conference adopted House figure.
[14] Includes $60,000,000 reserve authorization.
[15] Includes $72,500,000 reserve authorization inserted by House but stricken by the Senate, and the conference adopted $30,000,000 reserve authorization.
[16] Includes $15,000,000 reserve authorization.
[17] Includes $6,000,000 reserve authorization inserted by House but stricken by Senate, and the conference adopted $15,000,000 reserve authorization.
[18] Includes estimate of $7,100,000 for soil and water loans for Appalachia.
[19] Includes $50,000,000 reserve authorization approved by House but stricken by Senate, and the conference approved $25,000,000 reserve authorization.
[20] Authorization of $15,000,000 to be used from funds deposited in the rural housing direct loan account approved.
[21] In addition, not to exceed $500,000 of the funds from the various programs administered by this agency may be transferred to this appropriation for temporary field employment, plus $2,250,000 transfer from insurance fund.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that this is the first time I have ever handled this bill when there were not House amendments to propose at this time, which is another evidence of the amicable way in which this conference worked out.

I thank the Chair for its courtesy.

HIGH INTEREST RATES AND THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I was disappointed that, in his press conference today, President Johnson did not indicate a will for the hard decisions and firm action necessary to stop the damaging spiral in interest rates and to curb the rise in the cost of living.

This was the more disappointing because Johnson interest rates, already higher than Hoover rates, went still higher yesterday.

The interest rate on automobiles to dealers was increased yesterday by the General Motors Acceptance Corp. and the New York banks.

The profits of General Motors and of GMAC do not indicate a pressing need for an increase in the interest rate for dealers. The premium at which stock in big New York banks is sold does not reflect a pinch on profits. Furthermore, the excuse that they raised interest rates in order to ration credit simply does not hold water.

Automobile dealers must continue to carry an inventory They have little choice in the matter if they are to stay in business. The big three motor companies continue to ship cars to them and require them to keep the cars on their floors in order to retain their dealerships.

This kind of interest rate increase adds still further to the cost of the automobile that the working man and woman must buy. When the purchaser must finance his car on the installment plan, the added burden of high interest rates continues to mount. This increases the cost of living. This kind of interest rate increase is inflationary.

On page 14 of yesterday's Wall Street Journal, I find that secured notes are advertised at as high as 8¼ percent interest.

Mr. President, I am advised by people whose judgment and knowledge I respect that credit availability is reaching near panic proportions in some areas. Yet, President Johnson today was almost entirely negative as to programs to alleviate this damaging situation.

To cite another instance, on yesterday a young lawyer from Nashville, Tenn., Jack Robinson, was in Washington with respect to a ruling on the sale of bonds for the city of Nashville.

These bonds are entirely tax exempt. Yet they were sold at an interest rate of 5½ percent. A city like Nashville may be willing and able to undertake the financing of community improvement at rates of interest such as this. However, thousands of cities and counties across our country are delaying the construction of needed community facilities because of the exhorbitant interest rates that prevail today.

In the meantime, what has happened to the small investor who put his money in Government bonds? Government bonds were bid yesterday for as low as $79.20 on the hundred. A small businessman, a retired person, or any person who put some funds into these bonds, and who must now cash them in order to meet current needs, faces a loss of $208 on every $1,000 that he invested in U.S. Government bonds.

I respectfully suggest, Mr. President, that it is time for all Senators, all Congressmen, and all representatives of the people to make their sentiments, their views, and their suggestions known.

I hope that, before Congress recesses for the Labor Day weekend, President Johnson will submit a forthright program of coordinated action to bring down the high interest rates that prevail today and to curb the rising cost of living.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13712) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts in the chair). The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 49, lines 14 and 15, strike out "(other than partsman) or mechanic" and insert in lieu thereof the words ", partsman, or mechanic,".

On page 49, line 16, insert after the word "aircraft" the words ", or parts of any of the foregoing,".

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the sole purpose of this amendment is to restore the overtime exemption, provided in the bill as adopted by the House of Representatives, for partsmen employed by automobile, trailer, truck or farm implement dealers. As passed by the House the bill exempted from the overtime requirement not only salesmen and mechanics but also partsmen employed in these establishments.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for reasons which do not seem to me to be sound, has recommended eliminating partsmen from this exemption. I am firmly convinced that it would be neither fair nor justifiable to treat the occupation of partsman differently than that of salesman or mechanic for these particular purposes.

Because of the nature of these three occupations, it has been traditional for Congress to recognize that the ordinary regulations pertaining to payment for overtime work should not prevail. The House of Representatives recognized this fact and voted to continue in force the historic exemption of these three kinds of jobs from overtime provisions. There does not appear to be any meaningful reason why this practice should be terminated, especially why only one of the three occupations should be selected for treatment different than the other two.

Perhaps it would be helpful to make clear the type of work performed by the partsman and the effect which the proposed change might have on various business establishments. The partsman classifies, shelves and dispenses parts used by mechanics and sold to customers who come into establishments to make purchases. In many instances it is essential that partsmen work longer hours or at other than regular times. This is especially true in the farm equipment business where farmers, during planting, cultivating and harvesting seasons, may call on their dealers for parts at any time during the day or evening and on weekends. The result is that partsmen during some weeks of the year may work longer hours and on an irregular schedule.

This is particularly true in the experience I have had in the field. It is my understanding that on the average farm implement dealers, for example, will employ two or three partsmen. Most of them are employed on a year around basis. They are well trained and usually adequately reimbursed, frequently on a salary plus commission or bonus basis. In the farm implement business it is often difficult to keep partsmen on a regular time schedule because of the seasonal nature of farming and the effect which cold or bad weather may have on equipment maintenance. Because of these factors, it would not be easy to place partsmen on a time-clock basis and to compute overtime compensation in an equitable manner.

By way of illustrating this problem, let me cite certain situations in my State of Indiana which have been brought to my attention. The six examples which I will describe were selected at random from various sections of the State and present information about the employment situation of different farm equipment dealers and the effect a change in the overtime exemption would have.

First. Dealer with 13 employees, 7 of whom are mechanics and 2 are partsmen. One partsman received a guarantee of $96 per week plus a bonus on sales by the parts department, which last year averaged out to an additional $30 per week. The second partsman received a weekly salary of $80 and earned a bonus of some $20 a week extra. They each averaged about 48 hours of work per week, but during bad weather or out of season they worked short weeks and were able to take time off. During peak seasons they worked longer hours and were on call for evenings and weekends when parts were needed by farmers.

Second. Dealer with five full-time and seven part-time employees. One full-time employee was a partsman who received $90 per week salary the year round plus a bonus on sales averaging about $25 per week. He worked on the average 40 hours per week in the winter and 48 in the summer.

Third. Dealer with five employees, three of whom were mechanics and one a partsman. The partsman received a salary of $100 per week the year around plus a bonus averaging $25 per week. It is estimated that this partsman averaged 50 hours per week of work, but he is considered a part of management and allotted his time as he wished.

Fourth. Dealer with eight employees, four of whom are mechanics and one a partsman. The partsman has a basic work week of 48 hours, but it varies according to seasons. He received an $80 a week guaranteed wage plus a bonus on parts sales which averaged $30 per week last year.

Fifth. Dealer with seven full-time employees and two part-time employees, four of whom are mechanics and a partsman. The partsman received $85 per week plus a bonus on sales which averaged $20 per week. He worked an average of 48 hours per week, but it varied widely week to week.

Sixth. Dealer with 10 employees, 6 of whom are mechanics and 1 is a partsman. The latter received a flat salary of $125 per week, but he is also considered a part of management and operates on a profit-sharing plan through which he eventually plans to acquire the business.

These six examples are typical of farm equipment dealers in my State. It appears obvious that it would be impracticable to attempt to apply the standard overtime procedures to these employees. Moreover, to single them out for treatment different than that historically accorded to salesmen and mechanics would be patently unfair.

For these reasons in this amendment we seek to restore partsmen to the same capacity as salesmen and mechanics, as contained in the original bill which was passed by the House. There is no question about the irregularity of the need for parts when one looks at the agricultural industry. Also, it should be pointed out that many partsmen with whom I have talked and discussed the matter say that in the case of implement dealers many partsmen are on what is called a cost-bonus basis where they get a percentage of the cost of parts they sell in addition to a regular salary.

In addition, in closing I wish to point out that we are only talking about an overtime provision. The partsmen, as well as the mechanics, would be covered by the minimum wage provision. We merely seek to include them in the exemption with mechanics and salesmen from the overtime provisions of the bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment which has been so well stated by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the amendment. The other body saw fit, and properly so, to include partsmen as well as salesmen and mechanics employed by automobile, trailer, truck or farm equipment dealers in the exemption from the overtime requirements of H.R. 13712. This action was logical and consistent.

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has seen fit to delete these partsmen from the exemption. One of the reasons given at page 15 of the Senate report was that it was done in fairness to the wholesaler's distributors who have no minimum wage or overtime exemption.

It is difficult to see the consistency in this type of argument. Why pick on the partsman? Why not the mechanic or the salesman? Is the nature of their duties so different in terms of working hours or job requirements that they must be treated differently? The answer is "No."

The only sound and consistent procedure would be to include partsmen under the exemption. The partsman, as well as the mechanic and salesman of farm implement dealers, for example, are subject to substantial seasonal variations in business. They must serve the farmer when the farmer needs them.

The nature of the job of the partsman was described by Charles R. Frederick in the hearings on the Senate bill last year. At page 807 of part 2 of the hearings he points out the difficulties faced if the partsman were excluded from the overtime exemption. The exact situation referred to is:

How should time be calculated when a partsman, responding to an emergency call of a farmer for a badly needed part, goes to the store for that sole purpose?

In the same statement at page 803, the requirements of a partsman's job are highlighted. If a farmer needs a part to finish harvesting a crop and it is late at night or on Sunday, should he wait, and risk spoilage of his crop? He cannot and he does not. He calls the partsman and he gets his part to continue the work.

Are we going to say to the farmer who needs a part at night or on Sunday: You cannot get a spark plug, or a bell, or a gear, or some other item needed for your machinery, because the partsman is not exempt, but you can have machinery repaired by a mechanic who is exempt, and you can buy a new tractor from a salesman who is exempt? That is what we are telling farmers, servicemen, and farm equipment and implement dealers to do.

The services demanded by the farmer encompass the entire range of employees in a retail or service establishment. It is as Mr. Frederick points out, "not practically possible for dealers to operate within the framework of a 40-hour week." Since this is applicable to a dealer's salesmen and mechanics, it is just as applicable to his partsmen. The nature of all three jobs require that they be treated equally. There appears no sound reason to single out the partsman for separate treatment.

As I understand, more than half of the employees, in fact 70 percent in the average dealerships, are engaged in the operations of the service shop and the parts department. Both departments require men who are thoroughly trained. Partsmen handle many different parts. They are responsible for the stock, including prompt identification and continuance of supply. There are very few trained partsmen from which dealers can draw. This is the reason why most farm equipment dealers hire and pay their employees on a year-around basis. The dealer cannot depend on being able to secure trained men in a peak season if he does not continue to pay them during the slow season.

It is interesting to read part of the testimony of Mr. Frederick concerning the type of arrangement that dealers have consistently followed throughout the years in the matter of acquiring and retaining the partsmen that they need. Mr. Frederick stated:

A very recent survey indicates that 92 percent of the employees are employed year-around. Employees also receive many fringe benefits. The same survey shows that 98 percent are given paid vacations; 87 percent are paid while on sick leave; 95 percent have accident and health and life insurance, paid in whole or in part by dealers. Additional fringe benefits common in the industry are uniforms for shop and parts personnel, use of trucks for personal business, purchasing discounts, and extra time off for personal business. A substantial number of dealers offer additional incentives such as profit-sharing plans and year-end bonuses.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. I compliment the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for making that point, because I think that this goes to show that partsmen are receiving a fair shake and a square deal—if I may use that expression—as far as overall compensation is concerned.

I refer to the fact that this was the result of a survey we conducted of establishments in Indiana. I went over examples and I found bonuses and increased salaries based on sales ranging from a 25-percent to a 46-percent increase above the normal salary. I do wish to inject that.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator. His observation is pertinent. If one were to get into the spirit of the times because of seasonal demands on partsmen he would see the situation at first-hand.

In my State, where we have sugarbeets, a campaign is undertaken to harvest them. The entire community enters into the spirit of the occasion. They all realize that this is their payoff. The same is true in the potato business. When they dig potatoes, they have a campaign. The towns ring bells and blow whistles; the chamber of commerce holds a luncheon to kick off the effort. That spirit is maintained until the crop is safely harvested. Under these circumstances, of course, everyone has an interest in the spirit of the occasion. But there are many times during the year when this is not necessary, and compensating features are brought into the picture by the employer.

In other words, they have arrived at a way of doing business, such referred to in the excerpts just read. They have done it in such a way that everyone is happy. Everyone is served. They are doing the job. But now the Federal Government is going to enter the picture and to say, "You cannot do it that way. We are going to disrupt this method."

The Federal Government will be throwing sticks and stones in the way of an industry which cannot control the timing of production, an industry which cannot defer its deadlines on harvesting a crop. I believe that the Senate would be doing a service to the hard-pressed farm industry, and to the farm economy in general, if it would restore to the partsman the exemption which he enjoyed in the House-passed version of H.R. 13712.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that the same happenings occur in my part of the country. The partsman does occupy a significant and unusual position in the agricultural economy. He has to be available during the harvesting season—and before and after, to a lesser extent—at all hours of the day. Farmers during this harvesting season cannot wait for the regular kind of service; the partsman is an essential link in this special service.

I hope that the amendment will carry, because I believe it is worthwhile; it is also very much needed in the State of Montana.

Mr. BAYH. We have pointed out the discrepancy between the way we treat the mechanic and the way we treat the partsman. This has brought demands as to why the mechanic could not provide the service of securing the parts.

I do not think that anyone who has had the experience I have had in the rural areas, in this day and age, on the farm, realizes the degree of sophistication which is now being built into farm machinery. It is no longer a double shovel and a mule pulling the workload in the fields. It is very complicated farm machinery that the farmer uses today. Sometimes, an infinitesimally small difference between parts can determine whether a machine will work or not. Therefore, the knowledge and ability of the trained partsman is very much in demand. I can see a real controversy arising in any specific job where I am out combining late at night, say, or corn-picking, and my machine breaks down. If I have to get the partsman back on the job—and he does not get overtime—and he cannot get back to the shop in time, but the mechanic does—or the partsman does but the mechanic whom he represents does not—there will be controversy within the specific implement dealer's shop unless both these men are treated the same, as they have been historically.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I think there is a great deal of misunderstanding about this amendment. I should like to explain briefly what is involved.

Under present law, dealers in parts have to pay overtime. They were placed under the law at a prior date, but not the agents or those selling automobiles at retail were given an exemption under prior law.

In the past 5 years since, the independent automobile parts dealer along main street in every town and village in America has had to pay overtime to his employees who sell parts. The automobile dealer down the street does not. The automobile dealer is, therefore, at a great competitive advantage over the independent store owner, or the hardware store owner who sells parts.

Thus, this amendment would provide that the man who retails parts in an automobile dealership shall be under the same law as his independent competitor across the street in a store which sells automobile or farm parts.

Complaint is made that the mechanics are excluded, that they do not have to be paid overtime. The purpose of the amendment is to help the very people it purports to help. We wish to bring under overtime only those clerks in the

dealerships who are selling parts in competition with the other stores in town up and down the street.

General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford have expended great efforts in the parts departments of their auto dealerships in the past 5 years. They are sometimes said to be squeezing the little partsman out of business.

This amendment would try to restore the independent merchant to a competitive advantage. It would not affect the salesman. He can go out and sell an Oldsmobile, a Pontiac, or a Buick all day long and all night. He is not under any overtime.

The mechanic is not put on any overtime.

My experience with automobiles has been that the mechanic goes out and answers calls in the rural areas. It is not the partsman who goes out. The mechanic is not on any overtime. We have heard here of the partsman going out and repairing tractors and repairing automobiles. I say that the partsman does not go out and repair these cars and tractors. The mechanic does. The mechanic does. The mechanic is not on overtime. The committee should be commended for not putting them under overtime. We give no advantage to the store owner. We merely want to restore the position he was in, say, as the retailer, the man selling the parts over the counter here. I do not think that most of these partsmen work overtime, anyway.

When I go to an auto dealer along about 6 o'clock, the mechanics are there but the partsman has locked up his wire cage.

I say that Federal laws should not give one of them a competitive advantage over the other. This bill is merely for the enactment of a Federal law to be fair to the retailers and wholesalers selling parts, to treat all alike. Under the provisions of the law, we want to treat the retailer in that store alike.

Mr. BAYH. Perhaps the Senator from Texas has a different experience from mine. I have lived in a part of rural Indiana which did not have these factory owned parts establishments which the Senator is concerned about, saying that they do not compete against the small merchant. But I must say that I have been in an implement store, trying to get my tractor, combine, or cornpicker repaired, for which the mechanic could not find the necessary part; and he had to call the partsman, get him out of bed, and get him to come down to the store to show him which part should be used. Why should not the partsman be treated differently from a mechanic?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. From what the Senator is saying, if the mechanic does not know his job, or the partsman is part mechanic also, then he needs some further retraining. Of course, I admit that happens, sometimes. It can happen in any store, wherever the mechanic does not know what to do. I have gone into stores, such as Western Auto, and I have found the salesmen there sometimes knew more about what was needed to correct something wrong with my car than some mechanic.

Of course, that is not the purpose of the law. The purpose of the law is to give the mechanic freer range. If the mechanic does not know what parts are needed to repair a car, then we need better trained mechanics. But that does not change this law. This law does not put them under that. The Federal law would merely try to treat everyone equally who was selling these parts.

That is all the amendment would do, equalize the competitive advantage and not say that the Federal law will make one man selling parts pay higher wages to his employees than his competitor across the street.

Mr. BAYH. It does not say that the partsman can come down to the shop with the mechanic and the same two men will get paid a different wage for finding a part. The mechanic gets paid for putting it in the tractor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Not unless he comes under a certain number of rules.

Mr. BAYH. The provision does not take effect unless that criteria is met.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It takes effect only if there is overtime. Even the secretaries in the office would get overtime.

Mr. BAYH. There is no purpose in discussing this amendment unless we are talking about——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Suppose we consider a dealer in a Pontiac dealership: the secretaries get overtime right now. The mechanics and the salesmen do not. They do not get overtime because their work is outside. Why should not the partsman, selling parts over the counter, in the shop of any average dealer—a shop with busy secretaries, and similar clerical workers, receive overtime? If they work overtime, they should receive overtime. The partsman, behind his wire cage, retailing his parts, does not get that overtime. We are trying to give these employees an opportunity to get that overtime.

The salesman is not always inside. The mechanic is not always inside in every retail store. He is not protected by Federal law. The law does not confer a competitive advantage or disadvantage on some mechanics. But, under the law now scheduled, unless we adopt this amendment, he will not have a competitive advantage, but one group of people selling parts will have an advantage over the other.

There are two kinds of treatment for people selling parts, depending upon the nature of the store selling them. If the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Indiana is adopted, all it would do would be to have Federal standards for men selling parts back of the counter in a dealership, and another standard if it is an independent parts store.

I just do not think we should create a a law which gives one group the power to benefit at the expense of another. The purpose of the measure is to treat employers and employees equally. This might be called an employers amendment, an attempt to try to treat them equally. Contrary to the charges that have been made, we have considered employers as well as employees. We wanted the employers to prosper.

We did not put this measure in the bill for people selling parts. That is in the law. All we are doing is trying to give one group the same competitive advantage the other has. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana would give one group dealing in parts an advantage over another group.

Reference was made to the man who has to go out on the snow-covered field and furnish the part for a tractor. I lived in a rural area until I was 24 years of age. I go back there. I have always thought that it was the mechanic who generally knows the part to ask for that fits into a particular tractor, in view of the different models that exist. It is not the partsman that is the specialist at all; it is the mechanic generally who knows what part to use. He generally tells the partsman that he needs a certain part, for example, to repair a Buick, 1957 model. He does not need to ask the partsman; generally, he knows the part that is needed. The partsman is a retail clerk. He is not a specialist. The mechanic is the specialist. If the partsman were the specialist, he would be drawing more money than the mechanic. The mechanic gets paid more than the partsman. The partsman works inside. He hands parts out over the counter. All we do is leave retail clerks in an equal position or advantage. That is what the provision is designed to do.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, if I may have another word, I respectfully suggest to my friend from Texas that, the way he describes the competency or qualification of the partsman, it seems strange to me that we even have a category of "partsman." It was not in this Congress or by this committee or by the Senator from Texas or others of us that this distinction was made, and it is traditional that we have exempted partsmen, mechanics, and salesmen. Salesmen are a little different breed of cats, because they go out at unusual hours, trying to earn commissions. But I see no reason why, after historically we have put them together, we now say, "You are a mere partsman. You are going to be treated differently from the mechanic." It seems to me, rather than treating them the same, we are treating the partsman differently from the way he and the mechanics have been treated equally since we have had this legislation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The answer is that a partsman is an inside man. The reason for exempting the salesmen and the mechanics was the difficulty of their keeping regular hours. The salesman tries to get people mainly after their hours of work. In some cases a man will leave his job, get his wife, and go to look at automobiles. So the hours of a salesman are different. The partsman is basically an inside man. The salesman has been referred to as an inside man.

We are not trying to downgrade the knowledge of the partsman. He must have knowledge, just as the clerk who works in a hardware store must know what is sold. If he had no knowledge, he would not know the difference between a sixpenny nail and a twentypenny nail. In dealing with nuts and bolts and dif-

ferent parts that go into automobiles, surely it takes people with knowledge of those parts. Those people have to have experience. Those who work in retail stores, who sell piece goods to ladies, selling different kinds of cloth, must have specialized knowledge. This provision does not downgrade the partsman. The purpose of the measure was not to give one employer or employee an economic advantage over what his competitor down the street might have, but to treat all of them alike. It was not an attempt to downgrade the knowledge of one particular group, but the attempt was to treat the two groups of specialists alike, because if one was called a dealer, he would be exempt, and another who was called a retailer would not come under the exemption. This provision is to treat the partsmen and retail clerks alike under the law.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas a couple of questions. I am a member of the full committee, but not of the subcommittee. Personally, I have followed the lead of the Senator from Texas, who is the expert in our committee, in this extremely technical legislation. As I understand it, mechanics, salesmen, and partsmen were all brought under the law——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We are dealing with overtime.

Mr. CLARK. I understand, but I would like to get the philosophy of this matter. Under the administration's proposal, mechanics, salesmen, and partsmen were all brought in for the first time under this minimum wage law.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is right.

Mr. CLARK. This is an extension of coverage which, in my opinion, was long overdue. Is that correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It was.

Mr. CLARK. This portion of the persons proposed to be brought under the minimum wage law was opposed by the automobile lobby. Is that correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. In effect, the House yielded, to some extent, to the importunings of the automobile lobby and took out from the overtime provisions these three groups of mechanics, salesmen, and partsmen. I think it is a shame that the House did not adopt that which the administration requested. The effect of it was to get from under the minimum wage law, as a concession to the automobile lobby, this exemption with respect to overtime.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. In my opinion it is a shame that the House made an exemption for all three categories.

When the bill came to the Senate, as I understand, under the leadership of the Senator from Texas, it was felt it was not feasible to stand up and fight against the automobile lobby to the extent of restoring all that the administration sought, but in a spirit of compromise the Senator from New York, who is the ranking minority member, and the Senator from Texas, who is the chairman of the subcommittee, felt that we should at least take the partsmen out from the overtime exemption. There is not too much justification for leaving the mechanics and salesmen in it, but a distinction could be made for the others. An illustration was given of the mechanics who must go out on the field where there is a harvesting of sugarbeets. It is difficult to keep their time records. So, it was said, we will let the salesmen and mechanics out from under the overtime provision—thus cutting down on their wages and putting them in a wage category far lower than they had—but there is no excuse whatever for including partsmen in the overtime exemption, because the partsman, like the stenographer, would be working inside.

I am a "city slicker." I do not live on a farm. I wish I did. But it seems to me it would be a rare day when one would have to take a partsman, who seems to be a clerk behind a counter, to go along with a mechanic to help find out what is needed on a tractor or a piece of machinery used in harvesting sugarbeets. I am happy to support the Senator from Texas.

Is that not why the Senate committee went a little way in trying to cover people who should be included under this bill?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct. Reference has been made to the mechanic having to wake up a partsman to find out what part is necessary in a tractor. It is unlikely that a partsman would be needed to help the mechanic repair a car and tell him what is needed. I have never heard of it. It would be done only to a very limited extent, and one of the rare places where we have heard a partsman goes out with the mechanic at night to see what part is needed is in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand the situation, we ought to be worrying and shedding tears for the employer of the partsman, or extolling the work of the mechanic or the salesman or the partsman. I have no doubt that they are laborers worthy of their hire, but why should their employers get the benefit of paying them less than the laborer is entitled to, by exempting a man who is not doing the kind of work outside the store which gives some excuse, at least, for exempting the salesman and the mechanic?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I will say this to the distinguished Senator from Indiana: since the bulk of his remarks deal with farms and farming practices, and farming is different in his area than in mine, I would be willing to accept an amendment that would except dealers in farm implements.

But we have here involved aircraft, the great number of gasoline-propelled vehicles in this country, which are automobiles and trucks, and other fuel-driven machines.

If that is an impediment to the rural economy, I would be the first to wish to support the Senator's amendment. Perhaps there is something that we did not learn in the committee. Frankly, we did not learn in the committee that this was an impediment to rural communities. If it is, and if it represents any impairment of the farmers' ability to produce, I am willing to accept the amendment, if limited to farm implements.

Mr. BAYH. If the Senator will yield, I have never, to my knowledge—unless I did so inadvertently—stated that the partsman is going to accompany the mechanic out to the countryside. But if he comes into the shop at an hour at which he would not normally work, he is working, if he comes in to get that part.

I wish to emphasize, as far as equality is concerned—and we have been stressing equality of treatment—I think frankly we have a lot of points on our side that greater equality of treatment would be achieved by accepting my amendment, because the difference between the partsman and the secretary—the secretary being covered and the partsman not—is that the partsman, in a great many instances, is covered by a bonus or a percentage of the amount of sales that he makes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it has been suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania that there is no use shedding tears for the employer of the partsman. I understood the explanation for the elimination of the partsman from the exemption, it was because of tears which are being shed by the committee for the wholesalers-distributors, which prompted the committee to strike parts men from the exemption.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. Surely.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. They are the very ones whom this amendment would help—General Motors, International Harvester, and all the rest. The amendment would be helpful to them. We are talking about helping the hardware dealer, or the man on Main Street when we support the committee bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. Or the implement dealer. Not the distributor, but the dealer.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Not the dealer. It is the big distributors who would be helped by the amendment which the Senator from Indiana suggests.

Mr. HRUSKA. The committee may have a different idea of the English language than I, but according to the committee report, it narrowed the exemption from the provisions in the House bill to lessen the disadvantage to the wholesalers-distributors who have no exemption.

I am thinking about the relatively small farming communities and the county seats that have no wholesalers-distributors, but rather a repair shop, a service shop, or a small dealership. If you want to get at those distributor places, zero in on them, but do not include the many service places and small

dealerships, which have to depend upon a competent partsman to make their business run.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. All these retailers, these stores, one might call them—a better term would be "stores"—selling parts up and down the street. Surely they wanted to be exempt. They did not ask us to bring in the partsman. They said, "Exempt us, too." That would take partsmen all over the country out from under the coverage of the law.

Mr. HRUSKA. But they are running a different type of business. They are not subject to being called up in the middle of the night, or on Sundays and holidays, as are the small dealers.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. But many of them cannot survive now, because a man goes to buy his automobiles and finds his mechanics and servicemen there, and more and more, the parts departments of these dealerships are growing up. That is their competitive right, to build up their parts departments. That is part of the American system.

But our effort, in the committee, was to try not, under the Federal law, to give one man retailing parts an advantage over the others. All we are trying to do is to keep the competition equal, insofar as the Federal law is concerned; and not to have the Federal Government passing a law saying that if you retail parts from one type of store, you have got to pay overtime if you work your partsman over 8 hours a day or 48 hours a week. If we pass the House provision, we are saying that in another type of business, you can work your employees 50 or 56 hours a week, and will not have to pay any overtime.

It was the thought of the committee that if the Federal Government is reaching its long hand in here, if they are doing the same thing, and one calls his business a store and the other says, "I am an automobile dealer," that we should treat the partsmen, at least, both alike.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before the Senator does that, will he yield to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. Surely.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to point out one thing to the Senator. I was, as a matter of fact, a party to this effort to compromise. We could have gone either way, up or down. We chose to go up for both, instead of down for both, because the case made for the parties was equally persuasive by the dealerships as well as by the wholesalers.

But I should like to point something out to the Senator which I gather has not actually been done; that is the only reason I rise.

We did take care of one other big problem of the dealers.

Mr. President, may I be recognized independently? The Senator from Nebraska has been called from the floor, and will yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the point I wish to make is that we did take care of a very real problem of the automobile dealers in eliminating the idea that if their mechanics, their salesmen, and their partsmen were employed in a separate structure from the one in which they conducted the garage or service station, that that would deprive them of the exemption which they had. The report, at page 32, contains language which I proposed, to make it clear that the exemption will extend to the employer even if certain of the employees are separately housed. This is a tremendous advantage, because it was a problem, very greatly complained about, to the dealers.

Then our factual inquiry demonstrated that as far as the automobile partsmen were concerned, they did work regular hours, they were not, like the mechanic and the salesman, subject to call at any time that a fellow's car broke down, but the parts departments generally remained open at stated times, even in the smallest establishments. And therefore, the thing to do was not to deprive of the overtime partsmen of the wholesalers by grading them down to the level of the retail dealers, but rather to grade the whole thing up.

I do not subscribe to the idea that this is for any automobile lobby, and I do not subscribe to the idea that these amendments are designed to favor anybody. They merely equalize competition, and at the same time give the worker his due, which is overtime pay, in a perfectly normal operation which we found, as a matter of fact, does not have the vicissitudes and the uncertainties which can be ascribed to the jobs of the mechanic or the salesman. I think it is a perfectly fair compromise. It is constructive. I hope very much that the Senate will agree with that view. I yield the floor.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I modify my amendment which is at the desk.

I understand the Senator from Texas, who has a long tradition of agricultural background, is willing to accept this type of amendment.

I modify my amendment so as to make it read:

On page 49, lines 14 and 15, strike out "(other than partsman)".

On page 49, line 16, insert after the word "aircraft" "and partsmen primarily engaged in selling or servicing farm implements".

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAYH. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the amendment will refer to the selling or servicing of farm implements, is that correct?

Mr. BAYH. The Senator is correct.

The main thrust of this amendment would be to eliminate the argument previously made with respect to that industry or to dealerships dealing in that industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send his modification to the desk?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I send to the desk my modified amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modified amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 49, lines 14 and 15, strike out "(other than partsman)".

On page 49, line 16, insert after the word "aircraft" "and partsmen primarily engaged in selling or servicing farm implements".

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I accept the amendment as modified by the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the willingness of the chairman to accept the modified amendment. I am sure, after consultation with the Senator from Indiana, it will serve the purpose we are trying to achieve.

I fully support the modification and I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Indiana.

When this matter was discussed in the committee and in the subcommittee, I never heard the farm element mentioned. This was primarily a competitive situation among dealers on the streets of the cities and towns, which dealers were selling parts of automobiles.

I am glad we brought this matter up, so that we could be certain that farm communities would not be disadvantaged by the requirement that tractors and other farm implements be serviced on the farm. This is a clarification that is beneficial to the bill.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Senator from Texas for his cooperation and understanding. It has been enlightening to all of us to have an oportunity to explore the alternative opportunities and consider the impacts that would result. The amendment will reach the major objective we are trying to attain; that is, a removal of the burden that would be placed on rural America. I thank the Senator from Texas for his assistance.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Indiana for his contribution. He has been most helpful in the preparation of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am delighted that this problem has been solved. I assure the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Indiana that, as the Senator from Texas has said, our eye was not on this particular target—the farm implement dealer. I am much pleased that we have found it possible to satisfy what appears to be a legitimate need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am told that a problem arises from language on page 15 of the report. The problem relates to the paragraph entitled "Clarification and Consolidation of Exemptions Relating to Seasonal Industries and the Handling and Processing of Farm Products." We included certain conditions which, if they exist, will require overtime exemption for canning, packing, et cetera. The last three lines on page 15 read as follows:

Perishable refers to commodities subject to deterioration or spoilage under ordinary circumstances unless some affirmative action is taken within a short time to preserve them from spoilage or decay.

I ask the Senator from Texas whether the word "short" is an essential qualification to that definition or criterion, or whether the sentence is complete without it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is fortunate that the distinguished Senator from New York has raised this question, because there is a conflict in the language in the report. At the top of page 31 of the report, the paragraph reads:

Perishable covers products subject to decay or spoilage. A commodity is not to be regarded as a perishable at the time of delivery unless under ordinary circumstances some affirmative and continuous step such as refrigeration or canning is necessary to preserve it from spoilage or decay.

The last sentence on page 15, as pointed out by the distinguished senior Senator from New York, reads:

Perishable refers to commodities subject to deterioration or spoilage under ordinary circumstances unless some affirmative action is taken within a short time to preserve them from spoilage or decay.

It was the intention of the committee, at the sessions I conducted, that the definition of "perishable" should be that at the top of page 31, and that should be considered the correct definition. The staff worked under great pressure. It was a tremendous job. This 80-page report was compiled in a few days, and it was printed last night. It was filed yesterday afternoon, and the report was on the desks of Senators by 8:30 this morning. There is a conflict in the the language, and it was not intended that the definition of "perishable" at the bottom of page 15 include the words "within a short time."

Mr. President, for the clarification of the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the last line on page 15 be corrected by deleting the words "within a short time."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. With that deletion, the last sentence of page 15 will now read as follows:

Perishable refers to commodities subject to deterioration or spoilage under ordinary circumstances unless some affirmative action is taken to preserve them from spoilage or decay.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from New York. That was the understanding of the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Will the Senator repeat his request?

Mr. JAVITS. There was a unanimous request, Mr. President, to correct the report at page 15, in the last line thereof, and we would like a ruling on that.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during the time I have been permitted to be a Member of the Senate, I have been interested in and deeply concerned with the plight of the American farmworker. I come from a State which has more protective farm legislation than any other State in the country. I come from a State where the average hourly wage for farm labor, without board or room, was $1.42 as of January, 1966.

Let the RECORD clearly show, Mr. President, that the hourly wage rate for farm labor in some of the other States of the Union is as low as 65 cents.

During the administration of former President Eisenhower, the Department of Labor issued a report in which it said:

On balance it appears both desirable and feasible to extend Federal minimum wage legislation to agriculture, at an economically appropriate rate, in order to establish a wage standard for agriculture and bring about an improvement in the wage structure of hired farm labor. To do so, a Federal minimum wage would need to be applied to a substantial proportion of hired farm labor, in many areas, and particularly in the low-wage regions of surplus farm labor. It need not apply to all hired farmworkers in order to establish an effective minimum wage standard in agriculture. (Problems Involved in Applying a Federal Minimum Wage to Agriculture Workers, Department of Labor Report, April 1960.)

I am happy to observe that the bill before us provides some coverage, however small, to the American farmworker. I observe that section 302 of the bill provides that employees shall receive not less than $1 an hour during the first year following the coming into effect of the Fair Labor Standards Act Amendment of 1966, not less than $1.15 an hour during the second year from such date, and not less than $1.30 an hour thereafter.

It then goes on to provide for payment on the basis of piecework under the following verbiage. I quote from page 53, line 16:

Provided, That in the case of workers employed in agriculture in hand harvest work by an employer on a piece-rate basis, if during any workweek the average of the aggregated earnings of such workers exceeds the minimum hourly wage as prescribed above, the employer shall be considered to be in compliance with this section: *Provided further,* That no employee employed on such piece-rate basis is paid less than 75 per centum of the minimum wage applicable under this paragraph.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the comments of the committee on the provisions of the bill dealing with farm labor as they appear on pages 19 through 21.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL MINIMUM WAGE

The wages paid many farmworkers are far below the minimum wage standards established by the act. The minimum wage for covered agricultural workers will be $1 an hour beginning February 1, 1967; $1.15 an hour beginning February 1, 1968; and $1.30 an hour beginning February 1, 1969. Room, board, and other facilities customarily furnished employees by employers are "wages" according to their fair value or reasonable cost as provided for in section 3(m) of the act. In the case of hand harvest workers paid on a piece rate basis, the employer will be considered as complying with the act if the hourly average of the aggregate earnings of all such workers during any workweek exceeds the minimum hourly wage. However, in no event may any individual worker be paid less than 75 percent of the applicable minimum wage.

The committee is fully aware of its responsibility in extending the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act to agricultural employment for the first time. The initial rate established for farmworkers is the same rate set for all newly covered workers—$1 an hour in February 1967. The bill further provides that the increases in the minimum wage for farmworkers will parallel the increases provided for newly covered nonfarmworkers—in February 1968, to $1.15; and in February 1969, to $1.30. While the committee has provided for two additional increases for nonfarm newly covered workers so that all nonfarmworkers will be required to be paid at least $1.60 by February 1969, no schedule of escalation has been included to raise farmworkers to the Federal minimum wage of $1.60. It is the intention of this committee that all workers under the act be subject to a single minimum wage. The committee action in limiting the pattern of escalation for agriculture at this time to $1.30 in February 1969 is to insure that there be a careful evaluation of the effects of applying a minimum wage to agriculture. The committee expects that agriculture will adjust without adverse effects as have other industries under the act and that additional increases will be provided in the future.

A 1965 survey of 1.4 million hired farmworkers indicated that 70 percent earned less than $1.25 an hour; 50 percent earned less than $1 an hour; and 34 percent earned less than 75 cents an hour. Average hourly earnings in agriculture were $1.01 an hour on July 1, 1966, in the United States. In some States the average falls below 60 cents an hour and there are reports of wages of 30 cents an hour. About 2.1 million persons did farm wage work only and about 1.3 million were employed at both farm and nonfarm wage work in 1964. Those workers who did farm wage work only averaged about 100 days of farm wage employment and earned $689 during the year. Workers employed at both farm and nonfarm wage work did an average of 98 days of nonfarm wage work and 49 days of farm work and earned total wages of $1,379. There were 2.5 million households in the United States that contained at least 1 person who did farmwork for wages in 1964. Over half of these households had annual income below $3,000.

The two top classes of farms (class I equals $40,000-plus and class II equals $20,000 to $39,999, total value of farm products sold commercially) include only 9 percent of all farms, but they produce 50 percent of all farm output. These two top classes of farms pay out more than 70 percent of the total annual farm wage bill. In fact, class I farms alone pay out more than half of the annual commercial farm wage bill. Very recent sample studies indicate that this concentration of agricultural production and hired labor on large farms has been increasing. Such cost increases, focused primarily upon the largest agri-business enterprises who tend to be the price leaders, would tend to create a more favorable competitive situation for family farm operators. The imputed wage for the family farm operator and his family

would no longer be so drastically undermined by the tragic wages of workers on the largest farms.

Between 1950 and 1960 output per agricultural man-hour increased 69 percent compared with 23 percent in nonagricultural employment. From 1960 to 1964, the output per man-hour in agriculture increased 23 percent compared with 13 percent in nonagricultural industries. The labor of 1 farmworker supplied the farm products needed of 11 persons in 1940, 15 persons in 1950, 26 persons in 1960, and 33 persons in 1964. This has been accomplished through the use of improving farming techniques. Mechanical harvesting has made enormous strides and use of fertilizers and other chemical agents has grown rapidly. Despite this gain in productivity, wages of farmworkers have lagged far behind those of workers in nonagricultural industries. Not only have farm labor wages lagged behind those of other workers, but a widening of the gap between agricultural and nonagricultural wages, has in fact, occurred despite the fact that output per man-hour in agriculture was 2.7 times as great in 1964 as in 1947, while in nonagricultural industries it was 1.6 times as great.

The policy of the Fair Labor Standards Act is to provide a wage which will enable a worker to maintain a decent standard of living. If prices were to rise equally or faster than the rise in wages, the real earnings of workers would remain stable or decline. If the price of farm products were to rise more than wages as a result of the coverage of farmworkers, the intent of the legislation would be negated. Thus, the committee looked at the relation of the cost of field labor to the price of farm products to the consumer. The conclusion is clear. Field labor is a very small percentage of costs to the consumer. The cost of bringing seasonal agricultural wages up to the level of about $1.25 an hour is approximately equal to 1 cent per unit for most vegetables and fruits—per pound or per dozen or per head or whatever the ordinary unit may be. If retail prices go up more than that and if the increase is blamed on rising labor costs in the field, the American housewife should demand a complete and immediate congressional inquiry.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, over a year ago, on July 29, 1965, I introduced a bill in the nature of an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act, which would do two things. First, it would remove the exemption in the present law under minimum wage laws and would apply minimum wage standards to workers on farms which require more than 300 man-days of hired farm labor during any one of the four preceding quarters of the year. During the first year after the adoption of my bill, a minimum wage of not less than $1 an hour would apply. In the second year, a minimum wage of $1.15 an hour would apply. In the third year, the national minimum would be applied. That is, the national minimum set by the Congress.

Second, my bill would provide limitations on the use of agricultural child labor outside of school hours and when school is not in session. If this amendment were adopted, a child would be permitted to work in agriculture outside school hours, with exceptions for on a family farm, only if he were 14 years or older.

I am glad the committee has seen fit to take some action along the lines of my recommendations.

Mr. President, the amendment that I am about to offer is quite clear and to the point. It would provide, as does the bill before us, that in the first year of this bill's operation as a law, a dollar an hour will be the minimum wage for agricultural labor. It would provide that in the second year, as does this bill, the minimum wage for agricultural labor shall be $1.15 per hour. It would provide, as does this bill, that in the third year of operation of this bill as a statute, $1.30 an hour shall be the minimum wage for agricultural labor.

But it goes on to provide that in the fourth year the minimum wage for agricultural labor shall be $1.45; and in the fifth year $1.60 an hour shall be the minimum wage for agricultural labor.

Mr. President, I do not seek to change the 500 man-day requirement, although my bill a year ago would have provided for a 300 man-day requirement.

I do not seek to change the provisions of the piecework part of this section in the bill.

I do seek to provide that what we are about to do in the Senate with respect to an ultimate minimum wage of $1.60 an hour for people who work in industry, in businesses and in retail stores in America, will also be provided as a minimum for people who work on the farms.

In the years that I have been in the Senate I have listened to Senators bring forth legislation to help the migratory farm worker. We have appropriated money under various provisions of the law to help the migratory worker in America and his family. I have voted for every single one of those proposals as they have come forward in the Senate.

But here is an opportunity for Senators to demonstrate by their vote whether or not they are going to give the benefit of a minimum wage, however low it may be, to a farm worker on exactly the same basis as they are going to give it to a man working in a store down the street, or anyplace else in this country.

AMENDMENT NO. 763

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to be received, printed, and placed on the desks of Senators tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 53, beginning with line 12 strike out through the word "thereafter" in line 16, and substitute the following: "not less than $1.00 an hour during the first year from the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966, not less than $1.15 an hour during the second year from such date, not less than $1.30 an hour during the third year from such date, not less than $1.45 an hour during the fourth year from such date, not less than $1.60 an hour during the fifth year from such date, and not less than the minimum wage rate prescribed by section 6 (a) (1) thereafter".

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment (No. 769) and ask that it be stated. I do this with the understanding that it will become the pending business and will not be voted upon today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not understand that the Senator from Arizona is making a unanimous-consent request. I understand that he is announcing to the Senate he does not expect to have the amendment voted upon today. Let me say to the Senator that I am prepared to join him in whatever is necessary to see that that happens. I do not believe that he intends any unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

On page 52, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out the word "year" and insert "two years".

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from New York for his comments.

Mr. President, this amendment is a simple, prudent step to minimize the inflationary impact and disruption inherent in legislating an increase in the minimum wage to $1.60.

As reported by the committee, the bill provides for a 20-cent increase that would become effective only 12 months after the economy had absorbed the 15-cent increase to $1.40. Pennies may not sound like much, but consider the fact that this proposed increase is equivalent to an annual rise of 14.3 percent—a drastic upward movement that is without precedent in nearly three decades of minimum wage legislative history.

My amendment would not disturb the 15-cent boost to $1.40, but would stretch out the absorption period to 24 months—the same length of time voted by the House.

Actually, if we followed the pattern of increases and effective dates established in prior amendments to the minimum wage law, a 36-month period would be more appropriate.

Even the 24-month period called for in this amendment would exceed the historic pattern and most certainly would shatter the remnants of the administration's guidelines. It would produce an annual increase of 7.2 percent—a figure that is more than double the guideline concept.

The 36-month period by contrast would have produced an annual increase of only 4.7 percent, and this is considerably more in keeping with the guideline concept as well as past experience.

Mr. President, with all of the various statistics and percentages that have been employed on all sides of this matter, it is easy to obscure the fundamental point.

As the late George Bernard Shaw once observed:

If you took all the economists in the country and laid them end to end, they wouldn't reach a conclusion.

Nevertheless, there should be no doubt in anyone's mind by this time that seri-

ous inflation exists in the economy today—and it is getting worse every month. There may be debate about the extent but not the substance.

It is reasonable to assume that the more skilled workers, who have always enjoyed wages above the minimum, will continue to insist on their historic differential. If this bill is not amended, we will be legislating an immediate 14.3 percent increase over the first year in the average manufacturing wage.

This flies in the face of economic prudence and the mountains of evidence that attest to inflation's threatening proportion.

Surely, as legislators, we have a responsibility to do everything we can to exercise the kind of sensible economic restraint that we urge upon both management and labor.

In my judgment, it would be a serious mistake to step up the minimum wage so quickly.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, my view is that liberalization and expansion of the mimimum wage law is needed. I support the pending legislative proposal.

I shall, of course, listen to arguments on amendments as they are offered and shall vote in accordance with my judgment and conscience for or against such amendments.

Mr. President, 28 years ago, following the great depression, Congress enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act, declaring that it would be national policy to achieve minimum wage levels necessary for the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and well-being of American workers.

This is one of the many imprints which that great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, left upon the pages of the history of this country and which will doubtless endure forever. President Roosevelt called this beneficent legislation the keystone of the labor policy of his administration.

Mr. President, it was far more than that. For the first time the workingman or workingwoman at the bottom of the economic ladder was given the assurance of a decent standard of living. Since that time, Congress has three times acted to boost the minimum wage. In 1949, it was increased to 75 cents an hour; in 1955, to $1 an hour; and in 1961, to $1.25 an hour. Whatever fears existed in the past that a higher minimum wage would adversely affect marginal employers were found to be groundless and have long disappeared.

The pending bill will increase the minimum wage for those already covered to $1.40 an hour effective next February and then to $1.60 effective February 1968. For those not presently covered, the bill provides a minimum wage of $1 effective next February and 15 cents an hour each suceeding year until it reaches $1.60. For agricultural workers, it provides a minimum wage of $1 effective next February and 15 cents an hour each year until it reaches $1.30.

At the present time, there are 17,667,000 workers not covered by our minimum wage laws. Under the bill, as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 7,180,000 of these working men and women will come under the beneficent provisions of the minimum wage law if this legislative proposal becomes the law of the land.

Mr. President, we are fortunate in that we live in the richest nation in the world. We have the greatest material resources any nation has ever known. In the midst of this abundance, almost one-fourth of our people are living at or near the poverty level, unable to afford good health care, decent housing, adequate food, and proper clothing. Most are employed, but no matter how long or how hard they may work, they are not paid enough for their labor to meet the basic needs of daily living.

The Department of Labor estimates that a worker requires more than $2 an hour to support a family of four with a minimum decent standard of living. It is clear, therefore, that under present circumstances even $1.60 an hour can hardly be considered a satisfactory living wage.

The goods and services of employers who pay adequate wages must compete with those produced by unscrupulous employers who pay substandard wages. A realistic minimum wage will bring added prosperity to our businessmen, as well as to their employees. It will protect and develop their markets. People will have more money to spend, and will spend it on necessities. The fairminded employer will no longer be at a disadvantage with those who would depress wages to their lowest point.

Mr. President, this Nation can no longer tolerate having millions of its citizens condemned to a caste which virtually prevents bettering their lives and those of their families. One of the great promises of America is the promise that here all persons may live in comfort and dignity. This promise must be fulfilled. Substandard wages should be eliminated from the American scene. They are a relic of the past and cannot be condoned in this, the wealthiest nation on earth.

We may boast of our high standard of living and point with pride to our productive economy, but our boast will ring a little hollow and our pride will be somewhat tarnished when there are millions of citizens living in poverty in the midst of plenty.

We must help bring more of the fruits of the economy to all Americans by increasing the minimum wage and expanding its coverage. Thereby, we shall help bring to millions of American men, women, and childen just a little more of God's sunlight.

I am happy to support the bill. I shall gladly vote for any amendments that may improve or liberalize it. In the end I shall cast my vote for this bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an amendment has been offered today, to be voted on tomorrow, to stretch out the effective date of the increase in the second stage of the minimum wage from 1 to 2 years.

Under the bill as reported by the committee, the 29 million who would be covered by the minimum wage would have an increase to $1.40 an hour on February 1, 1967.

Then there would be a second step up to $1.60 an hour on February 1, 1968.

An amendment has been offered to stretch out that second step in that guaranteed minimum wage to 2 years, to February 1, 1969.

I would like to pause for a moment and point out what we are talking about by the minimum wage law; the 29 million who are covered, and the 7,200,000 new people to be covered under the minimum wage law.

At $1 an hour, if a man works 8 hours a day in some of these hotels, motels, doing hard, backbreaking work, 5 days a week, 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, without taking a single vacation or a day off on account of illness or for any other reason, his total wage will be $2,080 a year—$1,000 below the poverty level.

All groups in this country agree that one making less than $3,000 a year is in the poverty bracket, because that much is needed to provide a family with food, shelter, clothing, and medicines—not counting insurance and funeral expenses. But for the bare essentials of survival, for food, shelter, and clothing, all of that, that $2,080 would go, and it is below the poverty level.

Under the present law, where 29 million workers are covered, if they work 52 weeks a year, 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, without taking a day off, without being sick—if they get sick these wage workers do not get paid—without taking a vacation of even 1 day, they will receive $2,600 under the present minimum wage law.

When that hourly wage is increased to $1.40, and they still work 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, 52 weeks a year, without a day off, they will get $2,912 a year. If they are ill or are laid off, they get that much less. Most of these people want to work every day because they need all they can make to support their families just to survive. Yet, even when they receive that, they are still below the poverty level.

Before they can get to the $3,000 poverty level, they must come to the next step, $1.60 an hour. Then if they work 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, 52 weeks a year, at $1.60 an hour, without taking any time off, they will get $3,328 a year, and for the first time the minimum wage law will bring them to a level that is a little above the poverty level.

We hear it said that people above a certain age and certain disadvantaged people are those who live on this poverty level. But the fact is that the minimum wage at present does not provide earnings above the poverty level.

It is hoped to bring the 29 million, and an additional 7 million, for a total of 36 million, to the point where they can receive wages above the poverty level of $3,000 a year.

Now we are asked to stretch this out for another year before the people can get to a level just above the poverty level.

I have in my hand an editorial from the New York Times of August 23, 1966, entitled "Aiding the Working Poor." It reads:

Among the Americans hardest hit by the recent upsurge of consumer prices are the millions of workers at the bottom of the wage ladder, many of whom already earn so little that they must rely on public relief to supplement their weekly pay envelopes. These workers will be the chief beneficiaries if the Senate acts swiftly to approve the liberalized minimum-wage bill unanimously voted last week by its Labor Committee.

The bill would raise the present Federal wage floor of $1.25 an hour to $1.40 next Feb. 1. A year later the minimum would go to $1.60. The effective date for the second step increase is a year earlier than that set in the bill passed by the House last May. Unquestionably, the argument will be made on the Senate floor that the House date should be reinstated lest the double increase in the span of a single year aggravate inflationary pressures.

That is exactly the argument we are hearing, that this increase ought to wait for 2 years, because of inflationary pressures and because it will increase the cost of living.

Adverting to the New York Times editorial:

We believe that holding down wages for the disadvantaged is a poor way to combat inflation. The cost of living is currently going up at an annual rate of 3.5 percent, and another sharp rise was recorded last month. New York, with its hundreds of thousands of low-wage workers in Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant and other slum areas, had a July increase more than double the national rate, chiefly because of the higher subway fare. A complex of other factors, including high wage settlements for workers now earning three or four times the Federal minimum, threatens to push living costs up even faster. The impact of this upsurge is particularly cruel on those already at the borderline of subsistence.

That is where these people who are protected by the minimum wage law are—on the borderline of existence.

Continuing from the editorial:

Economists make out a persuasive case that the whole concept of the minimum wage needs re-examination. In many instances the effect of a higher wage floor is to speed the automation of work now done by the unskilled and undereducated—

And no one is more conversant with that problem than is the Senator who is presently presiding in the chair [Mr. CLARK], who has given more effort and study to this problem than has any other man in the Senate—

the groups with the highest unemployment ratio. But the consideration of some type of Government-guaranteed minimum family income or social wage to aid such workers is in too preliminary a stage to represent any answer to the erosion of their meager incomes by 1966 inflation.

We hope the Senate will not only authorize the timetable proposed by its committee but will persuade the House conferees to join in faster action. We hope, too, that recommendations for extending protection to seven million more workers, including some 400,000 on the farms, will also get quick concurrence.

Mr. President, I concur in that New York Times editorial.

I have here a letter which reached me today, signed by Mr. Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, dated August 24, 1966, reading as follows:

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: This is written in answer to your request for our views on the Fair Labor Standards Amendments Act of 1966.

It has been charged that the bill was inflationary, so we asked the White House and the President's Council of Economic Advisers whether it was inflationary.

They wrote:

The President's Council of Economic Advisers believes that the enactment of H.R. 13712, as amended by the Senate Labor Committee, will benefit the welfare of the Nation. The enactment of the bill will represent a major step in the process of eliminating substandard wages and working conditions, without imposing significant or abrupt cost increases on employers. Thus, the content of H.R. 13712, as amended, reconciles the goals of our social policy with the vital objectives of noninflationary prosperity for the American economy.

Providing the protection of the minimum wage to the American worker has been an important element in our national policy for almost 30 years. Underlying this policy has been the recognition that some segments of our labor markets work imperfectly and that many workers are at a disadvantage in bargaining with their employers. But in recent years, the protection has applied to a smaller proportion of private nonsupervisory workers than was the case in 1938, when the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed. Moreover, the level of the minimum wage has not kept pace with our economic advances. The enactment of H.R. 13712, as amended, will rectify these developments. The extension of the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act will bring for the first time the protection of the minimum wage to millions of workers in services, in the minimum for those already covered by the FLSA will make an important contribution toward the elimination of labor conditions that are inconsistent with the rising standards of earnings that characterize the majority of the American labor force.

The recent appearance of stronger upward price pressures in the economy naturally raises anew the question of the desirability of lifting minimum wages at this particular time. However, in our judgment, current circumstances are not such as to dictate further delay. In the first place, the provisions of the bill will become effective in stages; the timing makes possible a gradual adjustment without causing disruptive cost pressures.

Second, the minimum wage for the newly covered worker begins with a very modest figure of $1.00 and rises gradually over a period of 4 years.

Third, the fact is that under our present circumstances of virtually full employment, market forces are bound to raise the wages of the lowest paid workers faster than those of other workers. When the alternative for the low-paid was unemployment, employers in low-wage industries were able to retain their labor force even though their wage rates were considerably below the average. Under present circumstances of strong labor demand, wages paid in these industries have to rise faster than wages generally if these industries are to retain their workers.

Fourth, and finally, the lowest-paid workers are among those most hurt by the rise that has already occurred in living costs. Although a sound economic policy should not provide for all wages to rise more rapidly merely because the rise in living costs has accelerated, equity requires that the lowest-paid should have some additional compensation for the faster rise in consumer prices.

The minimum wage increase proposed by H.R. 13712, as amended, for those already covered by the FLSA reflects appropriate concern for the standards of noninflationary behavior of wages. As you know, the Council's wage guidepost provides for a specific exception in those cases "where wages are particularly low—that is, near the bottom of the economy's wage scales." The wages of those actually affected by minimum wage protection obviously fall into this category of exceptions to the guidepost and therefore should appropriately move up at a more rapid pace than the economy's productivity trend.

I wish to digress for a moment, Mr. President, from the reading of this letter from Chairman Gardner Ackley, to state that I do not believe that even with this, if we have a boost-up to these minimum wages, that the wages are going up, then, at a more rapid pace than our productivity trend, so rapid is that productivity trend.

But even if that be true, as Gardner Ackley points out, these wages are so low that it is justified to move them up faster, to get them up to a fair standard.

Returning to the letter:

Only in this way can our least advantaged workers move closer to the average standards of prosperity enjoyed by the Nation's labor force. When one takes account of the time span since the last increase in the minimum wage in 1963 and the timing of the increases scheduled by H.R. 13712, as amended, the rate of increase appears to take reasonable account of this particular exception to the guideposts.

In view of all these factors, enactment of H.R. 13712, as amended, will make an important contribution to the social and economic welfare of the American people.

Sincerely,

GARDNER ACKLEY.

Mr. President, I think this letter from the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and the editorial from the New York Times completely answer this effort to stretch out the effective date of the wage increase under the minimum wage law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Texas. He is a very modest man, but I also wish to say, as one of the privates in his legislative army in our Labor Subcommittee, that I am proud to follow his generalship.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Oh, Mr. President, everybody knows the distinguished Senator from Oregon is a general in these fights.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that the Senator from Texas has done a superb job in taking this very difficult bill through the committee and subcommittee. On various subject matters we marched up the mountain and marched down, and marched up again. I think with one of our agricultural amendments we went up and down four times—well, we went up four times, down three, and finally stayed up. We adopted the Morse

amendment, which makes it possible for boys and girls in this country to earn a little pin money during the summer, and also develop valuable educational training in the importance of earning their way.

I agree with the comments made by the Senator from Texas, reinforced by the letter from Dr. Ackley. There is nothing inflationary about this bill in that it seeks to correct inequities. Where there are inequities that can be proved in the wage structure, the inequities should be corrected. All during World War II, we had the same problems on the War Labor Board, in protecting the people of the country from an inflationary tornado; but we had the obligation to correct wage inequities that were shown by the evidence to exist.

These low paid workers in this country, not covered by a minimum wage and earning less than the minimum wage, are, by and large, exploited people. I think it very well that the Senator from Texas has read Dr. Ackley's letter, and has made very clear that in working for this legislation we are not working for an inflationary bill.

There are some corrections in the bill that I think need to be made. I shall offer some amendments in regard to them. But the general framework of the bill I enthusiastically support; and I was very proud to back up my chairman in the committee in regard to the general framework of the bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for his kind remarks here. We all know that in his knowledge of the field of labor law, he has no peer in the Senate. I think his service on the War Labor Board during World War II, his deanship of the Oregon Law School, and his long study of labor law would naturally lead one to conclude that his knowledge of American labor law exceeds that of any of the rest of us.

On the Labor Subcommittee and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I had his strong-armed support. Without it, this bill, I have no doubt, would not be on the floor of the Senate at this time. As chairman of the Labor Subcommittee, I thank him for his very powerful and effective aid. We hope we can move the bill forward. I appreciate the Senator's kind remarks, but we all know who the giant on labor law in the Senate is.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966 will never receive the national attention that the recent antipoverty legislation enjoyed. But I believe the improvement and expansion of minimum wage protection fires the most effective shot yet in the war against poverty—and we are not spending billions of tax dollars to do it.

What is more, I think the benefits derived from this minimum wage legislation will provide a far more significant and enduring weapon against poverty.

Certainly, Mr. President, there is a direct relation between poverty and the absence of minimum wage protection. I cite from the committee report:

There is a significant correlation between poverty earnings and exclusion from the protective provisions of the act. Among family heads employed in industries generally covered by the act, only 5 to 10 percent had annual incomes under $3,000 in 1964. The figure is 6 to 13 percent in industries where there is partial coverage of the act. But in industries where there is little or no coverage, the portions jumped to 29 and 47 percent, respectively.

The report also calls it a shocking fact that 41 percent of all children living in poverty were in families where there is a worker who has a full-time job throughout the year. In other words, employment alone is no bulwark against poverty when some wages do not receive minimum protection.

It is difficult indeed to explain the philosophy that it is all right for this group to endure poverty-level wages but not all right for that group. If there is any problem created by minimum wage legislation it is this inequity—and this legislation strikes at that inequity.

To my mind, the major thrust of the amendments is not the eventual increase to $1.60 an hour they provide but the extension of this protection to an estimated 7.2 million additional workers. This protection should be made as uniform as our complex economy will permit.

By relieving the plight of the "working poor," then, we are striking a telling blow against poverty and the bonds of poverty. It may well be that this single piece of legislation can accomplish more in this direction than all the titles combined in the Economic Opportunity Act—and at far less burden to taxpayer and the Treasury. Furthermore, these accomplishments do not carry the stigma of "Government handout" and the political controversy of Government relief programs.

As has the original act of 1938, this will enable countless underprivileged Americans to enjoy dignity as well as security.

We hear the same complaints and warnings against this measure that were advanced against the original legislation—cries of economic disaster and Government-created unemployment. By forcing an increase in some wages, the critics say, we will make it impossible for many employers to stay in business. Rather than a low-paying job, the worker will have none at all.

This argument has never had substance. History has proven it false. On the contrary, minimum wage protection has given a broader and firmer base to a growing economy. By expanding this protection, we are expanding those benefits.

As has been pointed out, the cost of increased wages is insignificant against an economy that today boasts a gross national product of $732 billion. But its benefits are far from insignificant. They amount to an estimated total of $2 billion in additional purchasing power offered to the additional poor who will receive this wage protection.

I spoke earlier of inequities in minimum wage protection and the need to make this protection more uniform. This not only helps the individual worker but ends what amounts to discrimination against States and areas that already enjoy high wage standards.

My own State of Nevada provides an excellent example. With an average weekly wage of more than $120 it has been difficult for Nevada to compete for industry with States that consistently offer low wage conditions.

Naturally, an industrial investor is lured to an area where he can manufacture his product for less money. If the prevailing wages are lower, he can cut costs. Thus, a high standard area such as Nevada has a built-in penalty so far as attracting new industry. By raising wage standards nationally, we give high standard areas a competitive chance instead of a penalty.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will act with dispatch and wisdom and enact this landmark legislation. By doing so it will render a vote of confidence in our Nation and its economy.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may meet until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, H.R. 14765, the new civil rights bill has passed the House of Representatives and very shortly will come before the Senate for what undoubtedly will be thorough and prolonged debate.

The most objectionable provision in the bill is that which would forbid discrimination in the sale or rental of property—the so-called open-housing section. Although the version passed by the House is much weaker than what the President asked for, it destroys private property rights which Americans have enjoyed historically.

Proponents of open housing argue that it will move the Negro one step

closer to "first-class citizenship" by enabling him to escape his ghetto conditions. Such hollow reasoning does not take into account the economic realities surrounding the Negro. Without an improvement in the Negro's economic plight, so-called open-housing legislation will be no more than an empty and frustrating promise to him. This type of phony equality is likely to lead to more charges of white hypocrisy against those who claim to be giving the Negro equal rights which prove to be meaningless because of other facts of life.

Most people have long since recognized that the Negro is to become a first-class citizen. My reason for voting against this clear erosion of inalienable property rights granted by the Constitution, is that I am trying to keep everyone from becoming second-class citizens.

The fact that they do not have the money with which to pay is what keeps large numbers of Negroes from owning good housing and enough property. When the Negro has enough money to buy property and to pay for good housing, he will find that the right to own his property exclusively and to sell it to whomever he pleases, is as precious a right to him as it has been to those citizens who have possessed such a right in a meaningful way since the beginning of American history.

It would be a sad plight for the Negro to find that he had achieved the rights of first-class citizenship, only to learn that the first-class citizenship of his day was no better than second-class citizenship had been in an earlier day.

It would be far better for the Negro to move up to the enjoyment of those many rights and privileges, including the actual full title to property, than for him to be the instrument by which historic freedoms were removed from everyone until all have been lowered to his level rather than raising him to theirs.

Prospects appear to be good that we will be able to defeat this part of the bill in the Senate. Not only southerners, but also many northern Senators who have supported past civil rights bills, notably Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, are against it.

Whether any part of the bill will pass I do not know. But if it does pass, it will not be because of my vote.

WORLD BANK LOANS HELP U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS; ITS LOANS ARE NOT FINANCED BY SOFT LOANS OF IDA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the debate of the foreign aid bill on July 26, 1966, I indicated to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] that I would like to submit his statement of that date to the World Bank, receive the comments of that institution, and thereafter take the floor to amplify the remarks which I made in reply to the Senator from Missouri.

I have now consulted with the President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—the World Bank. He and his staff have furnished me with certain data and statistics. However, the analysis in my statement of today is my own, based not only upon these recent conversations, but upon a longstanding familiarity with the World Bank and its operations and objectives.

Since 1948, when I first had contact with the problems of foreign aid in the House of Representatives, I have been deeply interested in the subject, and in the manner in which aid was administered both by national and international institutions. I can say with conviction that the result of this familiarity with the subject and the study of its operating institutions convinces me that the World Bank and its leadership constitute an extremely valuable asset for the free world and for the United States as a heavy investor in the Bank. We, in the United States, and those interested in beneficial economic development the world over have much reason to be gratified both with the existence of the World Bank family of institutions and with the leadership which has been given to the Bank by its distinguished Presidents, Eugene Meyer, John J. McCloy, Eugene Black, and now George D. Woods.

Before responding to the main points of the comments of the Senator from Missouri, I should like to point to some of the important factors in the problem of aid, or, as it ought more properly be put, in the problem of the relationship of the developed to the less-developed nations of the world.

So far as total volume of aid is concerned, the United States has reason to be proud of its participation in channeling resources to the less developed parts of the world in order to promote effective economic and social development. But it will not do to be smug or complacent. That economic development is a matter with which we must be concerned is hardly debatable. The contrast between the rich and the poor nations of the world is a striking one. Twenty or so industrial countries of Western Europe, North America, and the Western Pacific produce and enjoy more than one-half of the world's wealth. In those developing countries within the membership of the World Bank, a group which has one-half of the world's population accounts for only one-sixth of the world's gross national product. In a situation of this sort there is a very real threat, arising out of a world which daily grows smaller, but in which a large part of humanity exists on the bare edge of survival, while another segment continues—as it should—to improve its standard of living.

Not everything can be done by aid, and I would be the last to argue that all aid, whether multilateral or bilateral, has been effectively used. Clearly there have been many cases in which programs have been ineffective, and many others in which programs which would have been effective have been rendered impotent by the forces of external circumstances—wars or national catastrophies, disastrous drops in the prices of "one crop" economies, and so forth. But aid is and can be an effective tool; is and will be in the national interest of the United States and the other developed nations of the free world; and is, taken overall, a relatively modest effort at the present time. The total flow of official assistance from the developed countries which are members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to the developing countries has stayed at the same level of about $6 billion a year since 1961. Meanwhile, the national income of the developed countries has been increasing in the aggregate at a rate of about $40 billion to $50 billion a year. As a result, as a proportion of gross national product, the net official flows of aid have declined from an estimated eight-tenths of 1 percent in 1962, to six-tenths of 1 percent in 1964. And this despite the 1964 resolution of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, at which a goal of 1 percent of national income for foreign aid was generally agreed.

Against this background, the World Bank has been taking an increasingly more responsible point of view, and one for which I believe neither Mr. Woods nor the Bank has any reason to apologize. It has borne in mind the requirement of increasing and responsible aid to the developing countries. It has sought both to increase the amounts made available, and at the same time to insist upon performance standards which would insure the effective use of the aid. I find that it has done so in a manner which has taken properly into account the problems of the United States and of other members of the Bank.

With respect to these problems, the Senator from Missouri has suggested that the Bank has not appropriately recognized the balance of payments difficulties of the United States, in a manner comparable to that which it had recognized similar problems of the European governments immediately after the war, and he has suggested that "when the United States is suffering from payments difficulties, we should expect and receive comparable treatment." Now, in support of the proposition that the World Bank has had a beneficial rather than a damaging effect on the U.S. balance of payments, I have obtained from the Bank a chart showing such effects through the calendar year 1965 and I append that chart to this statement. The figures shown therein indicate that over the period from the inception of the Bank to the end of 1965 a net was paid by the World Bank to the United States of $867 million, and a net of such payments plus long term investments in the United States of $1,107 million. Even these figures do not always tell the story. They show what can be identified, without making allowance for goods and services purchased from the United States out of free foreign exchange which is released as a result of loans from the Bank or the International Development Association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this tabulation may be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. If one takes the World Bank and the International Development Association together, the benefits to the United States are somewhat mitigated, but are still substantial. During the 5 fiscal years from 1961 through

1965, the favorable effect on the U.S. balance of payments of World Bank operations averaged in the range of $150 million per year. IDA operations have a negative impact of approximately $30 million per year. Combining these two, there still is a net positive effect, beneficial to the U.S. balance of payments, in the average of considerably more than $100 million a year during the last 5 fiscal years.

Again, I should point out that even these figures are conservative. The negative impact of IDA operations has in the past arisen from the fact that procurement could be made more cheaply in countries other than the United States, and funds made available by IDA were, of course, used by the borrowers in the ways most beneficial to them. However, in the course of the past years, worldwide pricing has changed so that U.S. industry is, in fact, considerably more competitive than it was some years ago, and the trend of the U.S. share of earnings from Bank-financed procurement has risen some 6 percentage points in the first 6 months of 1966—from 21 percent in 1965 to 27.5 percent in the first 6 month of 1966.

It, therefore, seems clear that the operations of the World Bank and its soft-loan affiliate, the International Development Association, not only have been beneficial to overall U.S. foreign policy and to the American national interest in promoting the effective economic and social development of the less developed part of the world, but also have had a favorable effect on the American balance of payments.

The Senator from Missouri also points to an apparent discrepancy between the estimate of the World Bank that 60 percent of the U.S. contribution to IDA comes back to the United States in the form of orders for American goods and services and a Treasury memorandum of February 3 which states that in fiscal year 1967–68 U.S. procurement under loans of the IBRD and IDA would be 25 percent.

Inasmuch as about 40 percent of the subscribed capital of both institutions is contributed by the United States, the two figures are consistent. If the United States gets 60 percent of the U.S. contribution to IDA in the form of orders for U.S. goods and services—equivalent to 40 percent of subscribed capital—the United States should get, roughly, 25 percent of the total procurement made under IDA and IBRD loans. According to World Bank estimates, this is just about what the U.S. share should be in 1966.

Second, it has been suggested that soft loans by the International Development Association are helping borrowers repay their "hard" World Bank obligations.

I submit that the facts do not bear this out.

In the first place, it is the policy of the World Bank, reiterated to me by its President, to maintain the level of its outstanding loans in those developing countries which are receiving IDA loans at a constant level allowing for short-term fluctuations. In other words, to take the specific example of India, the Bank expects to receive in the forthcoming years repayments on earlier loans of some $50 to $60 million per year; but at the same time the Bank expects to make new loans replacing these earlier commitments, which will maintain the net existing level, and thus will mean that the Bank, on balance, is not drawing any money out of India.

In the second place, the Bank is continuing such a policy even in countries in which IDA does not extend any credits—countries such as Brazil. Here again, the Bank is maintaining a policy of not drawing down on its commitments, but of replacing payments on old loans with new loan commitments.

In the third place, it is clear that it is not the Bank that would be injured if the developing countries were in a position to have to reduce their service of foreign debt. All experience indicates that in such circumstances, the Bank would be paid and is paid even in the absence of any IDA credits, but that private creditors are those who have to take the burden of reduced inability to service foreign obligations. In fact, among all the countries which now have serious debt crises—mostly Latin American countries, Ghana and Indonesia—none is a country receiving IDA credits, and none has defaulted on a World Bank loan.

Mr. President, there are other points in the statement of the respected Senator from Missouri, referring, for example, to the lack of control by the United States of the World Bank and to the proportion of aid which the United States furnishes, to which I would like to make a brief reply. The United States, of course, does not control the World Bank, nor should it. But it does have 26 percent of the votes on the Board of the Bank and in IDA, and I understand that the United States has never been in a minority on any issue coming before either Board. The fact is also that U.S. aid has been declining as a percentage of U.S. gross national product. Moreover, in recent years, others have dramatically softened the terms of their development aid—the United Kingdom and Canada being the most outstanding examples—while at the same time the United States has been hardening its terms, although, of course, it started from a much more generous basis. The United States is only close to the average among 15 creditor countries both in percentage of grants, in total commitments of official aid and in percentage of grants plus concessional loans in the same total. Countries with higher than average proportions on both counts include Australia, Belgium, Norway, and Sweden.

The fundamental points, however, as I see them, sought to be established by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, were that the operations of the World Bank and IDA had a deleterious effect on the U.S. balance of payments and that IDA loans in effect financed repayment of World Bank "hard" loans. I believe that the facts cited above demonstrate the contrary, and I further believe that the U.S. Government as a whole can and should continue to give its full support to the operations of these distinguished institutions.

EXHIBIT 1

Estimated IBRD effects on U.S. balance of payments from inception of IBRD through calendar year 1965

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

	Inception to Dec. 31, 1956	Calendar year									Inception to Dec. 31, 1965
		1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	
U.S. payment of 1 percent subscription	64										64
U.S. payment of 9 percent subscription	571										571
IBRD bonds sold in United States, net of redemptions	442	164	356	−5	32	41	68	−19	−40	141	1,180
Net IBRD loan sales in United States	95	17	11	23	44	2	79	76	22	−35	334
Investment income earned by IBRD in United States	70	14	23	30	42	42	54	54	51	54	434
Total received by IBRD from United States	1,242	195	390	48	118	85	201	111	33	160	2,583
IBRD financed goods bought in United States [1]	1,260	188	185	150	148	136	176	209	146	136	2,734
Interest paid by IBRD to U.S. bondholders	105	18	28	36	38	40	42	42	43	45	437
Interest paid by IBRD borrowers to U.S. loan holders	12	4	6	6	7	12	12	14	17	17	107
IBRD administrative expenses in United States	51	12	13	8	10	11	13	15	17	22	172
Total paid by IBRD to United States	1,428	222	232	200	203	199	243	280	223	220	3,450
Net paid by IBRD to United States	186	27	−158	152	85	114	42	169	190	60	867
IBRD long-term investments in United States										240	240
Net paid by IBRD to United States and long-term investments	186	27	−158	152	85	114	42	169	190	300	1,107

[1] Includes procurement specifically identifiable as originating in the United States and the same proportion of procurement not identifiable by country of origin.

(At this point Mr. LONG of Louisiana assumed the chair as the Presiding Officer.)

THE PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed S. 3418, the Peace Corps Act of 1966. Unfortunately, it was necessary for me to be off the floor, to preside at a hearing of the Committee on Foreign Relations, while the act was under debate, and I could not be here to make a few comments about the bill.

I regret that the Committee on Foreign Relations deleted a new title II to the act as presented by the administration. This title would have permitted an Exchange Peace Corps with young people from the countries to which we are sending our own Peace Corps volunteers. However, language is inserted in the report which makes it plain that the amendment was adopted without prejudice to the creation of such a program under existing statutory authority. The report states:

(T)he committee notes that authority exists in section 102(a) and section 102(b) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (the Fulbright-Hays Act) for a program of this nature if the administration should find it a worthwhile undertaking.

I may say that this program is a refreshing exception to what is the usual State Department attitude of "nothing new under any circumstances; let's keep everything all over the world just the way it is."

I attribute the authorization and the imagination for this proposed new program to the new Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Jack Vaughn, who, to my way of thinking, is doing a magnificent job.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a portion of the statement of Mr. Vaughn, Director of the Peace Corps, before the Committee on Foreign Relations, which explains how the Exchange Peace Corps will work.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENTS

The Exchange Peace Corps would work like this. The sending country would recruit, select, and provide initial training for exchange volunteers, applying standards that are agreed upon by the United States and the sending country. The sending country would also pay for the international transportation of its volunteers. Once the exchange volunteers were in the United States, the Peace Corps would provide an 8- to 12-week period of intensive training. Volunteers would then be assigned to agencies and schools that had requested their service. They would serve for 1 to 2 years. Funds for allowances would come from the schools and agencies with which the exchange volunteers work.

The Peace Corps would coordinate and administer the Exchange Peace Corps, but the major responsibility for the programs, operation, and financing would go to the individual countries sending volunteers and to sponsor schools and other institutions in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly enthusiastic about the Exchange Peace Corps. I see it as a natural continuation of the work we are now doing overseas. This program offers an opportunity for those countries which have been receiving Peace Corps volunteers to contribute substantially to us in return. I have emphasized the importance of involving those nations with the United States in common projects and joint endeavors. It seems to me that a country which offers to pay for the recruitment, selection, initial training, and international transportation of a group of its citizens to work in the United States is making an important commitment.

An exchange Peace Corps also seems to me to offer a unique opportunity to continue our work of building bridges of understanding between our people and the rest of the world. Understanding, Mr. Chairman, is a two-way proposition. The Exchange Peace Corps—like the Peace Corps—is based on the philosophy that we have much to teach, but we also have much to learn.

I have little doubt, Mr. Chairman, that this program, if authorized, will succeed. Since the President proposed to create the program, some 17 countries have indicated an interest in sending volunteers. In this country many schools have asked for volunteers to teach their languages and to teach about their cultures. For example, the Riverside, Calif., schools would like to introduce a new course in world cultures at the ninth grade level to be taught by Exchange Peace Corps teachers. The superintendent of schools in Montgomery County, Md., has pointed out the need for "real, live relationships" between American students and people from the non-Western World. The director of language training for the New Mexico public schools has asked for teachers of Spanish for elementary and secondary schools.

We will proceed carefully. Our first interest will be in insuring that the Exchange volunteers have productive jobs and adequate support and supervision in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am very anxious that this program be understood. As one way of getting at the issues involved in the proposed program, let me tell you of the questions I have heard asked about the Exchange Peace Corps.

I have been asked if Exchange volunteers will be good enough to make a real contribution in this country. When I hear this question, I can't help thinking back to the early days of the Peace Corps itself, when Sargent Shriver described to foreign leaders what the Peace Corps could mean for their countries. Sarge likes to recall the head of state of an Asian country who told him he would not object to Peace Corps volunteers, but they would have little to offer the ancient culture of his country. Since then, that country and many more have seen the worth of our volunteers; they have multiplied their requests for volunteers many times over. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the same sort of thing will happen once Exchange Peace Corps volunteers begin to work in this country. Just by being here, they will contribute to our work of building international understanding. But, in addition, I think we will find that they do jobs in this country that very much need doing—and that they do them well.

Exchange volunteers will be selected, according to standards and procedures agreed between the sending country and the United States, to fill specific jobs requiring specific skills. They will be able to speak English. They will be screened for security purposes by the American Embassies in their countries before they are issued visas for the United States. All indications are that, just as we have felt in the case of our Peace Corps volunteers, the sending countries will want to send only their best to represent them.

I have been asked, conversely, if we are not requesting volunteers who are too highly skilled, whose services their own countries badly need. In the short run, this point has some validity. In the long run, however, I am convinced that the sending countries will profit greatly from the knowledge, the skills, and the broadened horizons that their returned volunteers will bring back with them.

I have also been asked if our program will duplicate existing Exchange programs. It will not. First, our program will draw volunteers primarily from countries that have not participated widely in the current programs. These are the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, which the Peace Corps has already helped bring closer to us. Second, our program will draw primarily upon young citizens of other nations at the beginning of their careers. It will involve greater training and fuller involvement of the volunteers in American life. Just as we expect Peace Corps volunteers overseas to contribute their total abilities to their assignments, we would expect Exchange volunteers to engage themselves in contributing beyond the limits of their particular jobs. Third, the program would involve far more financial and substantive participation by sending countries than is the case in current exchanges. Finally, while most exchange programs have emphasized teachers, many of our volunteers will work with social agencies, health organizations, and youth groups.

I have been asked, finally, if Exchange volunteers will really return to their home countries when their assignments are completed here. I am confident that, with some rare exceptions, they will. Their visas—so-called "J-visas"—will require that they leave the United States shortly after the termination of their service. The time limitations on these visas are extended only rarely, and we would oppose any extensions. In fact, fewer than 1 percent of those persons who have come to this country on J-visas in Government exchange programs have had these visas extended. A major thrust of the program will be preparation of volunteers for work in their home countries. I am sure that we, with the sending countries, can build incentives into our program, as well as prohibitions, that will result in a rate of return very close to 100 percent.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, another matter of special interest in this year's legislative proposals for the Peace Corps has to do with the school-to-school program. Under this program an American school raises funds to meet the cost of certain building materials for a school in an underdeveloped country. In his testimony before the committee, Mr. Vaughn indicated the desire of the administration to expand this program. In my judgment the school-to-school partnership idea is an excellent one, and I urge the Peace Corps to press ahead with the program.

I offer my cooperation to Mr. Vaughn. I should now like to make that offer publicly to assist him in every way in the schools of Pennsylvania to develop a real interest and some zeal in this school-to-school program which I believe is to the benefit of all young Americans who are going through our school system.

In this connection an amendment to existing law adopted by the committee should be helpful. This new provision

will make possible the establishment of school-to-school partnerships—already authorized by law—in areas other than those having Peace Corps programs.

STATEMENT OF PRAISE FOR SENATOR HILL ON 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF HILL-BURTON ACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a few days ago some of us noted the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Hill-Burton Act. It was slightly over 20 years ago that our beloved colleague, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], stood on the floor of this Chamber and argued with vigor and eloquence in support of a bill he was managing. He was then early in his second term in the Senate but this did not detract from the vigor of his advocacy and the majesty of his words:

> If the United States is to be strong—

He said—

> if its people are to carry the many burdens of peace and be prepared to defend it, ours must be a Nation whose people possess the strength of health. The passage of the pending measure will be a mighty step down the road of national strength and health.

The speaker was our respected colleague, LISTER HILL who is, as every Senator knows, chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on which I have the honor and privilege to serve. The bill he so brilliantly guided through the Senate was the Hill-Burton Act which President Truman signed into law on August 15, 1946.

Everyone knows what a mighty contribution the Hill-Burton Act made to the health of our Nation. Its benefits can be seen in nearly 350,000 inpatient beds; and new or additional facilities in over 8,000 hospitals, nursing homes, outpatient clinics, public health units, and rehabilitation facilities. This amounts to an expenditure of $7.8 billion with the Federal share of $2.4 billion. The act was indeed a milestone in Federal-State cooperation.

The act is now, I hope, to be extended in coverage in order to provide for substantial modernization of existing hospitals, particularly in slum areas of our country, many of which are located along the Atlantic seaboard. I hope that this program will soon be enacted into law under the brilliant leadership of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

It is every Senator's ambition to leave some mark of his presence here. Few of us are so fortunate. With the Hill-Burton Act, LISTER HILL became one such Senator who will always be remembered. That was 20 years ago. Since that time he has continued to look not at past accomplishments but at present problems and future needs. Judicious in his judgment and prudent in the expenditure of public funds, he will always be a pioneer of progress for the health and well-being of his fellow Americans.

It is of deep regret to me, and I know that it is to all Senators, that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is presently at home, recuperating from a painful injury in which his wrist was broken. His wrist has been in a cast for several weeks and he has suffered a great deal of pain. I hope that he will soon be back with us to bring to enactment those many measures presently pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I am sure that he will make an enormous contribution as the chairman of our committee.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] was in the Senate Chamber today.

Mr. CLARK. I understand that he was in the Senate Chamber today but he came in only as a matter of real duty to answer a live quorum call. He returned home because he was in considerable pain.

I know that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] joins me in the praise I have just given to the very great Senator who presides over the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and who is usually, but not always, assisted by the ranking minority member, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, let me explain to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who has just come into the Chamber, that we fought for him, and tell him how pleased we are that he is here. The only reason I had to state what I did state was that it had already been issued. I was afraid that the Senate would adjourn. However, I am delighted and pleased that the Senator has taken the time and trouble to read what I had to say. Undoubtedly, he will answer it in his usual, brilliant way.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, first let me express my appreciation to the able Senator from New York for his kind remarks.

I would have been over here earlier, but the Senator's address was thought provoking and fairly long. I will make a few remarks at this time and answer it in more detail later.

THE WORLD BANK AND ITS SOFT LOANS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President on last July 26, I made some remarks with respect to the current operations of the World Bank and its soft loan window, the International Development Association—IDA. At that time, my friend the able Senator from New York stated he would answer my position. This afternoon I received a copy of the statement he is making today. I will reply to it in some detail at a later date.

First, however, no one has more respect than I for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—the World Bank. The Senator from New York today mentioned its former presidents, all of whom I have held in high esteem. I do believe, however, that the policies and programs under which this Bank formerly operated have now undergone a radical change. In that connection, and as but one example, I cite first the creation of the Bank's soft loan window, IDA; and then the sharp rise in these soft loan operations.

In this connection, some of us do not see why the World Bank, presumably a nonprofit organization, does not use more of its great and growing surplus, instead of making these large demands on the Treasury of the United States in order to heavily expand its soft loan program.

Surely the situation when this Bank was created in 1947, at a time when the United States possessed most of the world's gold, and there existed the so-called dollar gap, called for operations far different from those considered wise today; because, as of this afternoon, the United States has less than half of the gold necessary to pay the current liabilities it owes to foreigners abroad.

As to the rest of the statement made by the Senator from New York, I will study the figures as he gives them, and then make further reply. At this time, however, let us note that just about every agency responsible for this serious and continuing drain of gold from the United States asserts that it is not responsible.

But for some reason, when we add up all these pluses, we end up with a large overall minus.

This is true to the point where, for the first time in a great many years, the gold holdings of the United States are now less than $13½ billion; again despite our current liabilities abroad, owned primarily by the foreign central banks, and redeemable directly or indirectly in gold, now exceeding $30 billion.

Now, we all know that there must be some improvement in the international monetary system in order to insure a continuing growth in world trade; and in this connection, some internationalists, and some in this country, recommend a denigration of the role of gold.

They may be right, but it would seem unfortunate that at a time when the United States is recommending negotiations incident to changes in international liquidity arrangements, this country continues to lose its gold reserves to those very countries with whom it is negotiating; and who are heavily increasing both their gold reserves and their total reserves.

Those who believe gold is relatively unimportant to the value of the dollar should do everything they can to sell this idea abroad, because we have been told on good authority that at the convention of international bankers in Madrid last May, friendly foreign central bankers warned of the importance of this country getting its fiscal and monetary house in order, primarily from the standpoint of correcting its continuing unfavorable balance of payments.

At that time they said if this was not done, heavy additional conversion of dollar holdings for U.S. gold could only be the result.

Perhaps this warning is partially borne out by what is transpiring these days on the New York Stock Exchange.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I think it would be the wrong time to enter into a debate at this hour of the night on this subject. The Senator from Missouri and I have been allies, and will continue to be, in this matter, but I think it would be unwise to enter into further debate on it tonight. I do hope that what we do will help both the Bank and IDA. I do not mean, when I say "help," as institutions, but to attain the common objectives which we have engaged in seeking to obtain. We have a big interest in the Bank and IDA, and we are probably their biggest supporters.

I would like to say this to my friend—and when the Senator develops this matter further, perhaps we can develop this further—I think the so-called continental bankers, whether it be central bankers or the Swiss bankers are exercising a disproportionate influence on the policies of the United States, as well as on other countries. At one and the same time when the Senator says they warned us that unless we put our financial house in order, that we would lose gold——

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would not put it that way. They own twice as much in dollars as we have gold to redeem those obligations. They say that if we do not put our financial house in order, we can only further liquidate these dollars and demand for them our gold.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not say they are right in their position from our standpoint, but do believe the continuing fiscal and monetary problems developing in this country, which the able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] have often dwelt on in recent weeks, have now gotten to the point where we must decide whether we do or do not need gold as background reserve for our currency.

If it is not necessary to have gold, if we can maintain the integrity of the dollar without gold, especially with those who hold billions of dollars of our liabilities abroad, that would seem satisfactory. But I am not sure it can be done.

Mr. JAVITS. I had not quite finished my thought. The Senator rather leaped in and responded before I had finished.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am sorry, but did not want the Senator to misunderstand the point I was trying to make about the influence of these foreign holdings. It has always seemed to me that the man who holds your note is relatively important to the borrower.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct, unless that person is in a position to pay off his note and not do any further business with those who engage in an improvident operation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In this case we could not pay off the note.

Mr. JAVITS. I think we could, because these are not gold notes; they are dollar notes. The only reason they can get gold is our commitment to give gold; there is no other reason.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The distinguished and able Senator when we started the discussion, felt we had better not debate it tonight. I appreciate his courtesy, and would prefer now to let our statements stand without discussing them further in detail. The Senator from New York is experienced on this subject. We agree on many subjects. On this we apparently do not. I would be glad to continue the discussion with him at another time.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator allow me to finish one statement?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I certainly shall. The Senator has the floor. I am glad to yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be finished in 1 minute. It is not necessary to go through this formalism. I merely wish to point out that the very same bankers who are giving this stern advice are the ones who are also telling us that the only thing which has kept world trade fluid and functioning is an imbalance in international payments, in floating excess dollars in the world. That seems to me to be a strange dichotomy. We shall discuss that point further.

I wish to add to the point the Senator from Missouri made to the effect that they could call on us. They had a $30 billion call against a relatively small amount of gold, so long as we continued to pay in gold. They themselves have the international trade, of which they are the main beneficiary—that is how they get the reserves—depending on the fact that there is an imbalance in international payments in dollars and sterling, thus keeping the whole structure afloat. I let the matter rest there.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My only comment in reply would be that we could sit here and argue a long time about the relative importance or unimportance of gold, which, in effect, is what we are doing. On the other hand, I think the Senator from New York will agree that no country in the free world has cooperated less with us recently than have the French, diplomatically and economically. The French today now hold more gold than any other country in the world except the United States. Europe, now holds more gold, in total, than we do.

There are many things we could do if called. As one example, we could go off the gold standard. We could be in a better position to pay our debts if we doubled the value of gold, but that would cut in half the value of the dollar.

The more we study the problems of fiscal and monetary responsibility, as has been done recently on the floor of the Senate, the better it will be for us and the country.

Let me say again, and with great respect to my friend from New York, I believe in the World Bank, which at one time carried on its operations on the basis of sound banking principles. In the past we were in a position where it was advisable to lend and give away our assets, faced with such things as the dollar gap. We had so much of the world's wealth at the end of the war. But that day has now come to an end.

The mayor of the city in which the Senator lives comes down here and says, "We need $50 billion for our town." A mayor from another town came down yesterday and said, "We need $250 billion for all the towns." The war in Vietnam is now costing between a billion and a half and $2 billion a month. The Senator from Tennessee has consistently pointed out the beating that industry, especially small industry, the average person, is taking in this country because of high interest rates.

There does not seem to be enough priority with respect to what we can do with the wealth of the United States. I have begun to question, considering all these things—the running of a large war, the financing of all these undeveloped countries to which the Senator referred in his speech, the multibillion dollar programs now being planned and carried out for education, for the control of water, for improvement in the cities—whether any economy in the long run, even our economy, can continue such gigantic expenditures indefinitely.

Whatever we owe ourselves is one thing, because the government has only single entry bookkeeping. With double entry bookkeeping we would be in pretty good shape, if we compare this Government balance sheet to a corporation. But when it comes to this continuing outflow of our wealth to foreign countries, I have begun to get worried; and think comparable apprehension is being transferred into the monetary and fiscal operations of the country today, at the expense of the average American.

Mr. JAVITS. I would urge my friend not to lose heart or confidence quite yet. But we will debate it more extensively at an appropriate time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is a great deal of difference between fear and apprehension; and I thank my friend for his courtesy.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR RUSSELL OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND SENATOR CASE TO ATTEND DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF NEW KNESSET BUILDING IN ISRAEL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, under authority of Senate Resolution 145, agreed to September 23, 1965, appoints Senator DONALD RUSSELL, chairman, and Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE to attend the dedication ceremonies of the new Knesset Building to be held in Israel on August 30, 1966.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 25, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate August 24, 1966:

AMBASSADOR OF THE UNITED STATES TO SWITZERLAND

John S. Hayes, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Drum and Bugle Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, August 20 through 27 has been designated National Drum and Bugle Corps Week. I wish to call this to the attention of my colleagues so that they may join me in paying tribute not only to the fine young people across the country who participate in drum and bugle corps activities, but also to the sponsoring organizations and devoted advisers who make possible such participation.

As past commander of American Legion Post 229, Utica, N.Y., I am especially proud of the Magnificent Yankees, a post-sponsored drum and bugle corps which has earned for itself an outstanding reputation both for the quality of its music and the precision of its drill. All the many virtues characteristic of the American people are represented in the Magnificent Yankees. The many friends and followers of the corps know the young men to be patriotic, and determined to succeed in all that they undertake, yet good natured and fun loving as they march along.

The Magnificent Yankees have provided me with many moments of excitement and pride. To me, the group is something special. As an organization it has won for itself trophies and blue ribbons for excellence in performing, but the most significant accomplishment has been the winning of the respect, admiration, and continuing interest of all our citizens.

The national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars will this week include in its parade in New York City over 65 such drum and bugle corps while Washington will soon witness similar display as this city plays host to the American Legion Convention. Thus we can sense the tremendous scope of this activity and its great impact upon the life of our Nation. At a time when too many young people are lax in conduct and appearance, it is very heartening and indeed exciting to watch clean cut, and smartly dressed outfits stage such thrilling performances of music and drill. Such a splendid group is a powerful antidote for juvenile delinquency.

The roots of the present-day drum and bugle corps are deep seated in our earliest history. The American Revolution began with a drum roll on Lexington Common and the muffled drums of past wars echo down to us today as part of our national heritage, reminding us of ideals of freedom and equality for which these wars were fought.

Today, many former members of drum and bugle units serve with our Armed Forces. Some are now in the combat areas of Vietnam. I am confident that the training they received as youths in local corps has helped bring these boys to manhood and has developed in them an awareness of the value of teamwork and discipline. Indeed, they are a credit not only to their organizations and hometowns, but to their Nation as well. I am proud to salute them.

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week our Nation will celebrate National Drum Corps Week. From the founding of our country until this present day, the drum and fife corps of our Nation have been a source of pride to all Americans. In every American city our young people can display their abilities and pride in country through their drum corps marches and exhibitions.

Historically we have drum corps as a traditional part of American life, ranging from the Revolutionary War and the Civil War right through to our present day. The backbone of every fine army was its sprightly drum corps and today the Armed Forces of our country continue to carry on this fine tradition in all their ceremonies. Young Americans find the drum corps to be a source of inspiration, fun, and challenge. In my own district we have three fine corps—the Lawmen, the Thunderbirds, and the Statenaires. They make every parade more spirited through their performances and are always eagerly awaited at every parade. I hope that the fine traditions of the drum corps will continue throughout our land and that they will continue in their fine work.

The Communications Workers of America and the 3.2-Percent Guideline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am gravely concerned by the threat of inflation. I am equally gravely concerned that in seeking to avert inflation we do not succumb to economic policies which would be equally harmful to the national welfare and progress.

While I believe, Mr. Speaker, in the principle of guidelines to govern economics and coordinate all segments of the economy, I have been disturbed to find that the guidelines figure of 3.2 for wages was, in the minds of some Government officials, rapidly becoming an inflexible ceiling for all wage increases, regardless of industry, geography, past practices, or skills involved. In this connection, I was heartened to read recent statements issued by one of the Nation's most respected and responsible labor unions—the Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO, which is headed by

Joseph A. Beirne. It seems to me that this responsible union has made an excellent case against an inflexible 3.2 percent guideline which appears unrealistic when applied to the collective bargaining problem between this union and the Western Electric Co., whose installation division employees are seeking a new contract.

I have little knowledge of the daily course of the conversation between the union and management representatives at Western Electric. However, I am impressed with the serious effort to find agreement between the two parties. This appears to be the essence of genuine collective bargaining. I hope that these negotiations may produce acceptable accords, not only for the people directly involved, but for the Nation as a whole. That is what the public has a right to expect from collective bargaining.

Order of AHEPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, proper and fitting tributes were paid to the Order of AHEPA last week by way of welcome to their 44th supreme convention here in Washington. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] stated for us then the AHEPA objectives, which all of us must recognize as among the most admirable of goals. The accomplishments of the lodge ably attest to how well these objectives have been fulfilled.

When we think of Greece and Hellenic culture—a better understanding of which AHEPA promotes—we think instantaneously of knowledge and freedom. More than 2,000 years ago, inquiring Greek minds explored every subject worthy of investigation, and that spirit of inquiry—that search for truth—has been the great creative force in the making of modern Western civilization. The spirit of freedom, both personal and political, which we regard so strongly as a part of our American heritage certainly has its counterpart in ancient Greece. Indeed, our meeting today as the freely chosen representatives of a free people draws its inspiration in large part from the councils and assemblies of the days of Cleisthenes and Pericles. Such is the heritage of the AHEPA membership.

But the Greek immigrants to this country in the 20th century furnish us with an example which ought not to be overlooked because of our reverence for that ancient society. In this day in which minority groups are demanding so much from the government and so little from themselves, I would loudly acclaim these immigrants who came to our country with little but their talents and willingness to work. Without asking for Government grants, special privileges from society, and the promise of security without contribution, these people started at the bottom and worked hard, saved their money, invested in our free enterprise system, and proved once more that America is the land of opportunity. Today there are few communities which do not have examples of their success. The Hellenic heritage is something to be proud of, but I say to you that the American citizen of Greek descent has something in his immediate past of which he can justly be proud.

I know that I am joined by every Member of this distinguished body in hoping that the delegates to the AHEPA convention enjoyed their stay in our Nation's Capital. In closing, I would like to acknowledge that Mr. Nicholas Pitanis and Mr. Joseph Clark were delegates to the convention from our Lexington, Ky., chapter of AHEPA.

To Stimulate Flow of Mortgage Credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to register my complete agreement with the action taken by the House last week in passing H.R. 15639, the bill to expand the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association. I was proud to vote for this action, which I believe to be a necessary and important step in alleviating some of the undesirable consequences of the current tight-money situation.

A combination of circumstances contributed to the development of what has been termed the present money "crisis." Institutions have raised interest rates in an effort to restrain the outflow of deposits. Thus, money for loans and mortgages has become scarce, and any available funds have been diverted to cover other short-term obligations. The competition for the scarce funds has left housing mortgages behind, and the result was a great strain on the facilities and supply of the FNMA.

New housing construction has correspondingly decreased due to this diversion of funds, making necessary some Federal action to regain a good level of building. Of course, the problem was not limited to the housing construction industry, as any decrease in this field severely affects other, related industries, such as supplies and materials. But now, thanks to this bill, over $3.5 billion will be available to prop up the homebuilding industry by increasing greatly the purchasing of mortgages.

I believe this move to be another important part of the Government's concern with the state of our Nation's economy. There can be no substitute for sound fiscal and monetary policy when dealing with a rapid and continuous expansion of the economy and, the overwhelming bipartisan support of H.R. 15639 amply demonstrates that this idea has been recognized. We cannot rely on chance or politics to bring about a stable economic situation—rather we must look to some hard thinking and some hard work.

This bill has further significance, which may indeed be its most important consequence. That is, it will result in the stimulation of private industry and funds. The Federal mortgage assistance will serve to give direction and impetus to private investment funds. I have always been a firm believer in the necessity of substantial private participation in actions that are designed to improve the overall economic health of our Nation. However, I also realize that the private sector alone cannot hope to resolve all of the conflicts and vicissitudes of a multibillion-dollar economy. Therefore, combined action becomes not only desirable, but essential. I see this bill as a fine example of that cooperation, and I trust that the results of your action will be fruitful.

Greek Immigrants to the United States: A Tribute to Accomplishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week representatives of the Order of AHEPA met in Washington for their 44th international convention. I would like to pay tribute to the AHEPA and the contributions made by Americans of Greek origin.

The Greek-American community is worthy of the highest praise. Its gifts are many; its accomplishments of the highest caliber.

Two main forces have contributed to the cohesiveness of Greek Americans: the church and the Greek press. The great majority of Greeks everywhere belong to the Eastern Orthodox Church. This is true also of the immigrants and their descendants.

New York is the see of an archbishop of North and South America who spiritually owes allegiance to the Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. He has under his jurisdiction in the United States some 301 churches. The piety of the Greek-American population stems from this source, and is a forceful contribution to the moral fiber of American life.

The Greek press is also vital. The first Greek newspaper in the United States was Neos Kosmos, which was first published for a few months in 1892 in Boston. Since that time at least 95 other Greek newspapers and magazines have appeared and disappeared. A score of

them still exist: Among them, two dailies, the Atlantis, founded in 1894, and the National Herald, founded 1915, published in New York and occupying a prominent place among the foreign language press of the country.

In keeping with the same general religious principles upon which America was founded, the policies of the Eastern Orthodox Church help enforce the moral stature of the American way of life. And in keeping with the same general democatic principles upon which our basic freedoms all were founded, the policies of the Greek press also serve to bolster the bulwark of democracy.

The allegiance of the Greek-American community to democratic ideals is unquestionable; the service of the Greek press and church invaluable to our cause.

Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, many good things have been said about Project Hope but this is one area in which the more recognition that is received the better.

Recently I wrote my weekly column, the Washington Watch, on this project and I wish to make these remarks available to all my colleagues. The column follows:

In many undeveloped countries of the world, the most valuable thing the people have is hope. The grim present is made tolerable only by the promise of a better future.

In many of these lands, particularly around the seaports, a great many children are found with the name of Hope. This name does not apply to their futures, however, but rather to the place of their birth. These children were born aboard the hospital ship *Hope* which is the product of the ingenuity and love of the free enterprise American medical profession.

Since 1960 the S.S. *Hope* has trained more than 3,000 physicians and nurses, treated over 100,000 persons, conducted some 8,000 major operations, and vaccinated one million people. More important than this is the impact this voluntary giving by free Americans has had around the world. This people-to-people approach has reached the minds and hearts of the plain and needy people of Indonesia, South Vietnam, Peru, Ecuador, Guinea, and Nicaragua.

Contact between the peoples of these lands and the volunteer doctors and nurses aboard the S.S. *Hope* has done more to gain us good will around the world than the billions of dollars spent in our Foreign Air Program. The point is that people around the world can tell the difference in that which comes from the pocketbook and that which from the heart.

Project HOPE is the American system in action—voluntary, generous and asking nothing but the chance to work hard to make life in the world a little better.

The doctors and nurses who have given of themselves have served their country's interests and those of mankind.

There are now plans to add a second white ship of HOPE to double our nation's effort. It will have my full support.

The spirit of dedicated service that typifies the American family doctor energizes this expanded venture in brotherhood—and the family the doctor will be serving is the family of man.

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the thousands of young men and women who will be participating this week in the activities surrounding National Drum Corps Week. The Million Dollar Pageant of Drums, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars; the National Jubilee, sponsored by the New York Kingsmen; the National Uniformed Group Championships, sponsored by the American Legion; the World Open Championship, sponsored by the Drum Corps News; and 60 other events from Maine to California certainly deserve our praise and recognition.

The spirit of enthusiasm and patriotism which these colorful, well-trained groups add to the flavor of American life is a pleasure enjoyed by all of us. It would be difficult to imagine a parade or public event without the stirring cadence of a drum corps as it passes by behind our Nation's flag. Our drum corps are a vivid reminder of the great history which is ours as a people.

For many years the fife and drum went with our troops to battle, calling military commands and encouragement to the men fighting for this Republic. The American Revolution began when a drummer, named William Dinman, beat the call "To Arms" on Lexington Common. And it was not until after World War I, almost a century and a half later, that drum signals were replaced as prescribed means of communications in our military manuals. Our drum corps were an active, vital force in the events which shaped our Nation's destiny.

Today in America, this worthwhile, disciplined activity is providing a form of wholesome enjoyment for thousands of young men and women across our land. And it is an activity which is not only fun, but one which offers an invaluable training ground for leadership and citizenship. The future of our country depends upon the development of leaders with disciplined minds and bodies. Discipline, coupled with love and understanding, is essential to the development of a sense of social values consistent with democratic living.

But, though a modern precision drum corps demands cooperation and personal responsibility from each of its members, it also gives much in return. It fosters a sense of accomplishment, personal pride, the enjoyment of music, and wholesome, friendly fellowship. It offers, also, the chance for travel through numerous competitions held each year and the opportunity to develop poise and self-assurance through public performance.

The adults who are giving so much time, money, and enthusiastic energy to the drum corps in their respective communities are doing so because they love young people and they love music, and this activity offers the opportunity to encourage both. Their efforts deserve the commendation of us all.

I am proud to note that my own district of South Miami is the home of the world-famous Vanguards Boys Drum and Bugle Corps and the Dade County Grenadiers—both groups which have distinguished themselves for their precision and showmanship.

National Drum Corps Week gives us a special opportunity to express publicly our appreciation for the outstanding contributions which America's drum corps are making to society. And I, personally, would like to offer my heartiest endorsement and praise for the service they are rendering to our Nation.

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the week of August 20 to 27 has been designated as National Drum Corps Week in honor of the more than 1 million teenagers in the United States who are engaged in this colorful and wholesome activity. On this occasion, I am very happy to join with my colleagues in the Congress to pay tribute to these young people.

This is a clean, interesting, and inspiring activity for our youth. They learn the rules of sportsmanship and how to take orders. They are taught the virtues of fair play. They learn the satisfaction that comes with doing worthy deeds as they provide entertainment for charitable affairs and perform at hospitals to help cheer up the patients. Finally they learn the rewards of diligence and practice as they develop a high level of skill and proficiency. Indeed, there is not a week in the year when members of these corps do not work hard and long to assure a high quality of performance at parades, civil celebrations, and sports events.

Throughout the country drum corps activity has grown tremendously in size and stature. I am sure my colleagues join with me in paying tribute also to the many thousands of adults who have made this growth possible by offering freely of their time, energy, and talents in order to supervise and train these youngsters.

I feel that it is particularly fitting that a week be set aside to honor all those engaged in this worthy activity. For all too few of us have stopped to consider the many hours of practice, private initiative, and organization that have made this activity great. This observance reminds us of the special place that the drum corps have in our national life.

Outline for Republican Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] on the record of the Johnson-Humphrey administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIONS OF THE JOHNSON-HUMPHREY ADMINISTRATION CITED BY SENATE GOP CAMPAIGN CHAIRMAN THRUSTON B. MORTON AS AN OUTLINE OF THE REASONS FOR VOTING REPUBLICAN

1.

Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON of Kentucky, Chairman of the Senate Republican Campaign Committee and former Chairman of the Republican National Committee, declared August 15, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration "has evolved into a wonderland of fun and games—with little regard for the taxpayer, little concern for the citizen, and little, if any, attention to the plight of the consumer." Senator MORTON listed these examples:

Item: The contempt in which high-ranking officials of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration hold the American people is ably documented by a speech made by Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Economic Advisers, at the University of Texas on April 15:

"Housewives are notoriously poor judges of what's happening to prices. . . ."

Item: President Johnson has repeatedly assured the American people he would make every effort to economize and to use Federal employees so as to make them economically productive. He promised a cut in Federal employment. This he has not done. Federal employment during the past year has risen more than a quarter of a million, the sharpest increase in the history of our Republic and definitely the largest increase in the last 12 years. Actual Federal civilian employment climbed from 2,508,119 in June of 1965 to 2,738,248 as of June 30, 1966. This is a net increase of 230,129 in 12 months.

During the Eisenhower Administration, Federal civilian employment dropped 4 times and during a 5th year it increased by only 135 employees. Since 1961 Federal employment has risen steadily except for 1964—an election year—when the Johnson Administration was trying to prove it was economically sound.

Item: The Administration claimed a budget deficit of "only" $2.3 billion in fiscal 1966. On July 21 Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware put the lie to this claim. The Senator documented his figures and came up with an actual deficit of $10.2 billion. Not a Democrat on the Senate floor contested his claim.

Item: On the basis of a 40-hour work week for every week the Democratic Administration has been in office since January 1961, the Nation has been living beyond its means at the rate of $40 thousand a minute. This amounts to $2.5 million an hour. The 6-year deficit amounts to $30 billion worth of red ink.

Item: During the last 10 days of fiscal 1966 the Department of Agriculture bought 29 hundred typewriters at a cost of about $500 each. The Department instructed each of its offices throughout the country to buy one typewriter. Senator WILLIAMS has estimated that had the Department followed sound fiscal policy the purchase would have been made by soliciting bids on a mass basis and the Department could have saved one-half million dollars on this purchase alone.

Item: President Johnson has decided to allocate $10 million for a housing project in Alaska. This allocation was made despite a contention by his own people that the project was not economically sound.

Senator WILLIAMS said: "The only explanation we received was that in turn for approving the 10 million dollar project he could pick up one vote on a major bill he was trying to ram through Congress. This indicates that the price tag this Administration puts on one vote is $10 million. This is a big price."

Again, nobody challenged the statement.

Item: In 1961 the interest on our national debt was $8.9 billion. Today under the Johnson Administration the interest has jumped to over $12 billion a year and this amounts to more than a billion dollars a month just to pay interest.

Item: The crisis in credibility in Washington is so serious that the American people no longer trust their own Government. This doesn't seem to bother anybody at the White House. In fact, they joke about it. White House Press Secretary Bill D. Moyers told a gathering of radio and television newsmen, "The crisis of credibility has gotten so out of hand that we don't believe our leaks."

Item: CBS commentator Eric Severeid has declared: "I have observed there is a difference between the Irish Mafia (under President Kennedy) and the Texas Mafia. You may still receive the knife, but you get prayed over in the process."

Item: The spendthrift nature of this Administration has caused even Democrats to pause and wonder. Congressman SAM M. GIBBONS of Florida, Democrat, had made this comment: "We used to say we don't want any of that tainted Federal money. Now, we say 'tain't enough."

Item: In recent weeks the President has made a great show of anguish over his claim that his budget has been ballooned by the Congress. He is attempting to blame the representatives of the people for his own failings.

Senator NORRIS COTTON of New Hampshire, a veteran Republican, has explained what happened and why it happened in a very succinct paragraph: "The President has been playing an old game—present a deceptively low budget by cutting necessary programs—let Congress put them back and bear the onus for the deficit."

Item: LBJ has cut the school milk program, the school lunch program, funds for land grant colleges, funds for the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Rural Telephone Administration. He cut funds for the Farmers Home Administration, for farm research programs for the Cooperative Extension Service. Incidentally, this program started out as a service to farmers but as city suburbs spread out to what was once farm country, this program is geared now more and more to the needs of suburban home owners and suburban housewives.

Item: The President has constantly bamboozled small business by promising small businessmen the moon and handing them some rather moldy green cheese instead. Small businessmen are caught in a financial squeeze. Their inventory buying has been sharply reduced because of a lack of credit. And their ability to meet the rising costs of doing business has been severely hampered. For months this year the Small Business Administration was a disorganized agency without a director and without direction. It was unable to fulfill its designated functions and is, indeed, wallowing in its own inefficiency. The losers: small businessmen who received no services and the taxpayers who footed the bill.

Item: By year's end the F.A.A. is expected to approve two model supersonic airliners. The Great Society will spend 2 billion tax dollars on the project. And to this day nobody knows, 1. Whether anybody will want to ride in the 2,000-mile-an-hour planes, and, 2. Whether any domestic airline is in the slightest bit interested in buying and using such aircraft. The whole idea seems to be to beat the British to the punch, whether the end product is worthwhile or not.

Item: Rent Supplements. The Administration and its supporters in Congress have been able to put across a very false impression of the rent subsidy bill. First of all, they claim that it is a $12 million proposition. It isn't. This is a 40-year program and once the $12 million voted this year is committed Congress will have to reappropriate $12 million for each of the 39 remaining years (presupposing the program is not broadened). This makes it initially a $480 million program. What they really wanted was $50 million a year—that is what they asked for originally.

As the bill stands, people eligible for the rent subsidy can move into a better home and will be required to pay from 20 percent to 25 percent of their income for rent.

The Government will make up the rest.

2.

The farmer has become the forgotten man of the LBJ-Freeman Administration, Senator MORTON charged. "They talk about higher income, but what is higher income if it buys less today than before?" he said. "Under the Johnson-Freeman farm policies, parity has dropped! During the Eisenhower years it averaged *84.5* percent. Since then it has averaged *78* percent and this summer was *79* percent." In the Johnson-Freeman undeclared "war on agriculture," Senator MORTON pointed out these facts:

Item: The Administration cut down hide exports.

Item: The Administration increased beef imports.

Item: The Administration dumped CCC-stored grains to knock down market prices.

Item: The Administration ordered the Defense Department to quit buying pork to knock down hog prices.

Item: The Administration tried to gut the school milk and school lunch programs.

Item: The Administration has stopped watershed projects at the Budget Bureau.

Item: The Administration has continually tried to reduce REA and RTA loan funds.

Item: The Administration called for reductions in soil conservation programs.

Item: The Administration tried to reduce extension service programs and the FHA loan program.

And worse—they tried to blame the farmer for inflation.

Crass Cynicism: Secretary Freeman, talking to Democratic candidates in Washington, D.C., advised them to "slip, slide, and duck" the food price issue. However, if cornered, he suggested they play up to the farmers rather than the housewife—because farmers are organized and housewives are not.

(Source: Washington dispatch of July 28 to the Chicago Tribune, published July 29, section 1, page 17.)

And, on August 16, the Commerce Department officially reported farm income in the United States declined for the fourth successive month. The White House and Secretary Freeman cannot duck this stark fact.

3.

"The Pocketbook" is one of the most critical issues of today. While the White House makes page one news in commenting on a $2 or $3 a ton increase in steel, comparatively little is heard about the $500 or $600 a ton increase in bacon prices (and the farmer isn't to blame). Senator MORTON gave this rundown on the history-making increase in the cost of living:

Bread, bacon, and baloney

The New York Daily News (July 25) quoted a butcher as saying he preferred to wait on young couples. Explained the butcher:

"I hate to see grown people cry. The young ones at least don't remember what prices used to be."

Said the President of the United States in Des Moines, Iowa, June 30:

"When those folks (apparently Republicans) start talking to you about inflation, you tell them that is something you only have to worry about in Democratic Administrations."

The cost of living reached an all-time high of 112.9 in June (latest figure to August 17). That means, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics:

1. The 1933 dollar is now worth 40 cents.

2. The 1940 dollar is a little better, 43.2 cents.

3. The 1957–59 dollar (on which the current cost of living index is based) is now "capable" of buying 88.6 cents worth of groceries.

Never before in all our history has the dollar been so debased.

The cost of living increase in the first 6 months of 1966 was the biggest 6-month jump in 8 years. And, also in June, mortgage interest rates jumped 2 percent—in just that month. (Figures from Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

"Higher taxes and higher prices more than wiped out whatever additional income Americans earned in the 3-month period ended June 30, the Government disclosed today," United Press-International news service reported in a dispatch from Washington July 25. "After paying accelerated payroll withholding and other taxes, and adjusting his income for inflation, the average American had $10 less purchasing power in the second quarter than in January, February, and March," the news story said. United Press-International also reported:

"Per capita take-home pay, adjusted for inflation, fell from an annual rate of $2,287 in the first quarter to $2,277 in April, May, and June.

"The second-quarter decline in purchasing power followed 1965 gains of $22 in the first quarter, $19 in the second, $60 in the third, $29 in the fourth, and $17 in the first quarter of 1966.

"The figures were prepared by President Johnson's council of economic advisers.

"In a June 30 speech at Des Moines, the President said Americans had been outpacing inflation because incomes had risen faster than prices. He was talking about the past five years.

"But during the past 12 months, while incomes have continued to advance, prices have risen at a much faster pace than before. As a result, the man in the street has had to run even faster to stay ahead. In the second quarter, he fell behind.

"According to the council's figures, Americans' personal income rose nearly $9 billion in the second quarter to an annual rate of $573 billion. But taxes increased $4 billion to $73.6 billion and thus ate up nearly half the income gain.

"That left Americans with $499.7 billion in after-tax income before figuring the impact of inflation. They spent $472.1 billion and saved $27.6 billion, or more than five cents of each after-tax dollar.

"At least some of the higher Federal taxes Americans paid in the second quarter were deliberately imposed to fight inflation by taking more money out of consumers' hands.

"Thus, in the absence of higher taxes, prices might have risen even faster than they did.

"If inflation is ignored, per-capita incomes rose from an annual rate of $2,525 in the first quarter to $2,542 in the second. But if both figures are translated into "constant" dollars—to take account of inflation—the per-capita incomes or purchasing power fell from $2,287 to $2,277.

"This could spell trouble for Democrats in the fall elections. It is also likely to add to labor demands for big wage increases to offset the higher cost of living."

The money squeeze and interest rates

Since the day a Democratic Administration eagerly adopted the Populist "cheap money" philosophy, the Democratic Party has billed itself as the party of low interest rates and the degraded dollar. Despite "crocodile tears" on the part of the Administration, the American people find themselves in a vise: Johnson's high interest rates squeezing against a tight money market. The phrase "Johnson interest rates" is the term used during debate in the Senate July 28 by a Democrat who condemned his Administration for economic policies causing the highest interest rates in more than four decades. All segments of the American public are involved.

Item: Home buyers are paying 6.4 percent, 7¼ percent, and 8 percent interest for mortgage money.

Item: Major New York commercial banks raised automobile financing rates from 4¼ percent to 4¾ percent a month ago. This means automobile buyers will be paying 9½ percent simple annual interest instead of 8½ percent.

Item: The City of New York accepted bids July 26 on a $112.9 million bond issue at an interest rate of 4.65 percent—the highest rate on New York municipal bonds in over 40 years.

Item: The Kentucky Turnpike Authority had to pay 4.81 percent to borrow money on a recent bond issue.

Item: The Treasury Department July 18 had to offer six-month bills (short-term borrowing) at 5.1 percent interest—highest in 45 years.

Item: Treasury had to raise interest rates to 5¼ percent to refinance some $9 billion worth of bonds (long-term borrowing) due for payment August 15.

Item: Notes issued by some Federal agencies are paying as high as 5.87 percent interest.

Where the pinch hurts

A. Home Building: 1. New starts, FHA inspected and approved: June 1965—15,500; June 1966—12,200. 2. Annual rate sale of all homes (seasonally adjusted): June 1965—778,000; June 1966—518,000. 3. New homes sold: June 1965—15,700; June 1966—13,300. 4. Annual rate of sales, new homes, seasonally adjusted: June 1965—154,000; June 1966—127,000. 5. Applications, FHA home purchases: June 1965—81,100; June 1966—53,700. 6. Home loans made by savings and loan associations insured by Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: May 1965—65,237; May 1966—50,822.

B. Private Construction: Annual rate (seasonally adjusted) includes home building and all other private and commercial construction: January 1966—$53.3 billion; June 1966—$51.2 billion.

C. Public Construction (Federal, State, local): January 1966—$22.8 billion; June 1966—$22.5 billion. Example: A large urban renewal project in Alexandria, Virginia, was cancelled July 28 because the money market was "too tight."

Note: On August 16 commercial banks in large cities increased their prime interest rate to 6 percent. "Prime interest rate" is that charged the largest and most creditworthy customers, mostly corporations. This boost was the fourth increase this year. Such an increase usually sets off interest rate jumps throughout the credit field.

D. Labor Force: The AFL–CIO Building Trades Council reports a gradual but steady decline in employment over the past four months. Council spokesman states: "Every day there's been a little less work and a little less money." Hardest hit has been Southern California. "There's a real bad unemployment problem among our members there," according to Building Trades Council spokesman.

E. Education:

1. School construction is being slowed by the inability of school districts and other local government units to borrow money at reasonable interest rates.

2. Individuals attempting to borrow money to finance college tuition and expenses for their children find themselves unable to borrow or else forced to pay higher interest rates.

3. Institutions of higher education dependent on borrowed funds to match Federal or State funds for school construction will find themselves increasingly in a tight situation due to high rates, tight credit.

F. The effect of the tight money policy on small business can probably best be gauged through a July 19 dialogue between Representative JOE L. EVINS of Tennessee, Chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, and Charles L. Schultze, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Both men are Democrats. The exchange:

The Chairman: "We have had testimony here yesterday and we have had appeals for the need and necessity for the direct loan program. This is the real heart of the SBA program."

Mr. Schultze: "Well, obviously what is happening, of course, is that over the past year and a half the money markets have gotten a lot tighter and Federal program after Federal program, the total demand for direct loans relative to the amount of funds available have gone up substantially. This is true in SBA. It is true in housing. It is true in farmers. It is true in HEW It is true wherever we have a direct loan program. . . ."

The Chairman: "Mr. Schultze, I think I speak for the majority of the Committee. We feel when there are periods of tight money and high interest rates, the first ones who are hurt and feel the pinch are the small business sector of the economy."

Mr. Schultze: "You have a good point there and I am not arguing that at all."

G. July Auto Output fell 38 percent.

H. Due to the increasing difficulty in borrowing money: State and county officials are concerned that projects involving school construction, sanitation facilities, water development facilities, streets, highways, and public buildings will either be scaled down, postponed or cancelled.

Caesar's share

Taxes and Politics:

The present Administration has consistently used the power to tax for political purposes. In 1964, everybody got a tax break. Republican efforts to cut excise taxes (in effect a national sale tax) were defeated because of Administration pressures. In 1965, President Johnson recommended a cut in excise taxes, claiming the idea as his very own. The cut was enacted. In 1966, he came back to Congress and asked that the

cut be repealed. Also in 1966 the President asked for authority to impose a graduated withholding tax on salaries and earnings.

There have been repeated suggestions from the President that he be given authority to raise or lower taxes on a standby basis, to meet changing economic conditions. No such authority has been granted by Congress which would, by enacting such authority, abdicate its constitutional responsibility in the taxing field.

Newspaper columnist Henry J. Taylor observed this month the Johnson-Humphrey Administration was playing a shell game, resorting to the practice of rigging. "When they tell us they're giving us something they're switching the pea," he said in reporting:

"All Presidents through World War II taxed the people $248 billion. This included two World Wars. The New Frontier-Great Society has taxed us about $500 billion. In only five and a half years this is more than twice as much as all administrations have taxed us in 156 years. And Washington still cannot pay its bills."

State and local taxes

There is a general trend toward higher and higher State and local taxes in the United States to meet the increasing demand for services by a growing population.

Examples: 1. The State of Maryland authorized a temporary 1 percent local income tax for the first time in 1966. It was immediately imposed by Montgomery County. 2. The State of Virginia for the first time imposed a State sales tax for 1966, effective September 1. A number of cities and counties immediately added a local sales tax on top of the State tax.

Gold is for giving

In less than a decade the gold reserve in the United States has dropped by nearly $10 billion, from a little over $23 billion to $13.3 billion as of August 1, 1966. For the past five and a half years American dollars have been moving overseas for imports, foreign aid, foreign military assistance, to pay American troops stationed overseas, investments abroad and tourism, at a rate exceeding the flow of dollars into the United States by about $3 billion a year. So what? What do an imbalance of payments and a dwindling gold reserve mean to Americans? The basic answer can be summed up in one word: Jobs. U.S. foreign aid and foreign investments have created in Europe and Japan an enormous and strong industrial economy. These industrial complexes have been able to produce nearly everything from transistors to trucks, from stained glass windows to steel ingots, more cheaply than they can be produced in the United States.

Result: Fewer jobs for workers in these industries, fewer opportunities for new employment in these industries.

Sample: Ironically, souvenirs sold at the Iwo Jima monument in Arlington, Virginia, have stamped on the bottom, "Made in Japan."

4.

"NOBODY'S GOING HUNGRY—YET" BUT THE SILENT MIDDLE-INCOME GROUP POURS OUT ITS COMPLAINTS, FEARS, ALARM ON RISING PRICES

"There's just no catching up. You're always falling a little bit more behind." "No matter how much you make, you could use two more jobs." "If I had to buy clothes, I couldn't make ends meet." These were just a few samples of how people feel about the highest cost of living in history and quoted by the New York Daily News August 17. Senator MORTON called attention to the intensive newspaper survey and study, made in depth by a team of 10 reporters. People from middle-income families were interviewed. The News said complaints and alarm poured forth from almost everyone. "Nobody's going hungry—yet. Nobody goes without shoes. But inflation . . . . has begun to erode (people's) sense of security and make them fearful of the future," the newspaper said. The News found middle-income families "caught in the relentless squeeze of costs that soar and taxes that weigh heavily." It stated a disturbing picture was emerging from the survey.

"The financial pressures that have hit all middle-income families across the country have hit New Yorkers in spades," the News said.

"The answers coming back to the News from the long silent middle millions hint that the current inflation is breeding more than just financial problems. It may be stockpiling social dynamite."

J. Arthur Trudeau: Pioneer in Mental Retardation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a speech I made to the members of the Warwick Rotary Club in Rhode Island in tribute to a very close friend and former schoolmate of mine, the late J. Arthur Trudeau:

J. ARTHUR TRUDEAU: PIONEER IN MENTAL RETARDATION

(By Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, Warwick, R.I., Rotary Club, June 28, 1966)

As members of a club which has actively concerned itself with the problem of mental retardation in this State, I know the name of J. Arthur Trudeau is well-known to all of you.

Tomorrow marks six months since the sudden death of this great humanitarian. For me his passing meant the end of a long personal friendship and the loss of a powerful and esteemed colleague in the fight against mental retardation. For Rhode Island and the Nation his death meant the passing of one of those rare men who build upon personal tragedy a lifetime of service and dedication to their fellows.

Tonight, on the eve of this solemn anniversary I hope we may together recall some of the accomplishments of J. Arthur Trudeau and also look briefly at some of the major Federal programs in the field of mental retardation. Many of these programs have their roots in Arthur's pioneering efforts to arouse the public to the plight of the mentally retarded.

It was the birth of his own mentally retarded son in 1939 that set J. Arthur Trudeau on a lifelong crusade to bring understanding and hope to the mentally retarded.

In 1939, mental retardation was no less of a national problem than it is today. Yet virtually nothing was known about it, and there were few who were trying to learn. Usually no distinction was made between mental deficiency and mental illness.

In too many instances, the mentally retarded, especially those who were dependent adults, were closeted away as the secret shame of their families. Little mention was made of them in the family circle, once the doctor had made his final pronouncement that nothing could be done. The mentally retarded child, if he had a kind family, could at best expect sympathy and good maintenance care. But neither true understanding of his problem nor scientific help to aid him to become a productive member of society was available.

The less fortunate mentally retarded child or adult was placed in a public institution and received much of the same harsh treatment as was then often accorded the mentally ill. By the middle 1930's studies of eugenics were interpreted to prove the potential danger to society of mental retardates. These studies caused more than half the states to adopt compulsory sterilization laws designed to prevent retardation in succeeding generations.

That those laws which still exist are seldom enforced is a credit to our collective good sense. It is now widely believed that sterilization is highly unlikely to appreciably reduce the numbers of mentally retarded in future generations. Some retardation is inherited, but other forms result from infectious disease, brain injury, and social deprivation. Retardation occurs in families at all social and economic levels and may not be present at birth.

It was thus a hostile world J. Arthur Trudeau faced when he began his long drive for understanding and help for his son and for the other mentally retarded children of this country.

After trying in vain to find help for his son, J. Arthur Trudeau helped found the Parent's Council for Retarded Children in 1951. He was chairman of the Association's first fund drive and served as the group's president from 1955 to 1957.

I vividly recall one evening in 1954 when I attended a meeting of some parents of retarded children at Arthur's invitation. Although at that time I had been active in the field of health legislation for some time and was quite familiar with most of our nation's great health problems, I must confess I was very much in the dark about the scope and consequences of mental retardation.

That meeting served to open my eyes to a problem that we now know to be the number-one affliction among children. Only mental illness, heart disease, arthritis, and cancer have a higher prevalence in our total population, and these tend to come late in life, while mental retardation comes early.

Yet in 1954 not a single Federal dollar was being spent on research in this field. Most facilities for long-term care of the mentally retarded were pitifully sub-standard, and qualified medical and technical personnel in the field, woefully scarce. Welfare assistance for families with retarded children was similarly inadequate.

Even those families who could well afford to sustain expensive long-term medical care found the situation hopeless. Mrs. Sargent Shriver, sister of President Kennedy, recalled in a magazine article two years ago that two decades previously, when her family sought help for her retarded sister Rosemary, they found little but "cynical despair."

"Even 10 years ago," she reminded us, "not a single university was focusing on mental retardation. Scientists cared little about it, doctors regarded it as hopeless, the public confused it with mental illness."

I left that meeting back in 1954 deeply shocked, yet at the same time encouraged by the optimism of those brave parents who refused to believe the doleful pronouncements that nothing could be done.

I brought the story of that meeting back to Washington and I soon found that very few people were aware of the scope and depth of the problem of mental retardation. Once all the facts were brought to light however, I am glad to say, Congress responded in 1956 with the first Federal appropriation—$750,000—for research in mental retardation. This is a relatively small amount by today's standards, but certainly enough to start things moving.

The confidence of those courageous parents I met ten years ago has been magnifi-

cently borne out. Progress in meeting the medical and social needs of the mentally retarded has been gratifying indeed.

Yet a true crusader is never satisfied until nothing less than ultimate victory is attained. Despite the great strides taken toward the conquest of mental retardation in the past decade, J. Arthur Trudeau never relented in his efforts to, in his words, "help my boy Kenny, number one; and to help other kids, number two."

Arthur was elected a director for the northeast region of the National Association for Retarded Children in 1957 and the following year was named to the Advisory commission for Ladd School. In 1962 his unceasing work led to his nomination for a leadership award of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation.

Arthur paid a great honor to me in his work to incorporate the John E. Fogarty Foundation for the mentally retarded. The Foundation was an outgrowth of the work he began in 1962 as chairman of occupational training at the Center which also, thanks to the generosity and good will of the people of Rhode Island, bears my name.

In April 1965, Governor Chafee appointed J. Arthur Trudeau to a 12-member advisory council on mental retardation to study the needs for comprehensive community programs in the State. And, a year ago this month, Arthur was appointed to a three-year term to the state Advisory Council on Mental Retardation. That J. Arthur Trudeau did not live to complete this term is our immeasurable loss.

Nor did he live to see the completion of the community center for retarded children in Apponaug. When that center is completed, it will serve as a fitting memorial to one who worked tirelessly to raise funds for its construction.

Yet he would have been grateful in the further knowledge that the State of Rhode Island has at last decided to lend its support to the center.

The awareness that J. Arthur Trudeau helped to create in the field of mental retardation spread beyond the borders of this State. His pioneering efforts played a major role in shaping the comprehensive Federal mental retardation program we have today.

I have been privileged to be one of the architects of this Federal program which includes preventive services designed to reduce the incidence of mental retardation. Maternity and Infant Care projects provide health care to prospective mothers in high risk populations. Nearly thirty such projects have been approved. Grants also support screening programs for phenylketonuria (PKU) and other metabolic disorders which lead to mental retardation. As of September, 1965, thirty-two States had enacted laws concerning PKU, most of them making screening of this disorder mandatory.

Other programs are administered through the States to increase the health and welfare services available to the retarded. These programs are helping to enlarge existing mental retardation clinics by adding staff, increase the number of clinics, and begin evaluations of children in institutions. State agencies, with the help of Federal funds are extending screening programs, providing treatment services for physically handicapped retarded youngsters, increasing in-service training opportunities, and providing homemaker and other care services for the mentally retarded.

The mentally retarded receive a variety of services through programs supported by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. These services include diagnosis, physical restoration, counseling and testing, and assistance in job placement and follow-up to insure successful rehabilitation. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965 will assist in the rehabilitation of additional mentally retarded persons to productive lives.

Projects supported by the Public Health Service include new techniques of providing services to the mentally retarded such as new referral methods, new methods of care and management of the retarded, and improved methods of care, treatment, and rehabilitation. Major emphasis is being given to projects which will result in the provision of the array of services needed for comprehensive and continuing care.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provides the opportunity for school districts to develop creative educational programs for the mentally retarded.

Training programs for professionals who work with the mentally retarded are a part of many of the service programs. These include professional preparation for research in the biological, medical and behavioral sciences. Training grants help supply personnel for the provision of health, social, and rehabilitative services for the mentally retarded. Other grants help to train teachers and other educational personnel in the special education techniques necessary to the teaching of the mentally retarded. Presently close to 5,000 teachers are in training for teaching the mentally retarded and other handicapped children.

The Social Security Amendments of 1965, which included Medicare in its provisions, also vastly increased the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's program for training professional personnel who work with the mentally retarded. New authority included in these amendments will make possible the training of a variety of additional personnel through grants to institutions of higher learning.

Approximately $34 million was devoted in fiscal year 1966 to research supported by the Public Health Service related to mental retardation. Grants from the Office of Education support research and demonstration projects in the area of education and projects related to the adaption of communications media to educational problems of the mentally retarded. The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration supports research projects that seek to coordinate community resources for the mentally retarded.

Funds are awarded by the Department for construction of three types of facilities for the mentally retarded. The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 provides for the construction of research centers to assist in the development of new knowledge for preventing and combating mental retardation, university affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded to provide for training of physicians and other professional personnel, and community facilities for the mentally retarded to provide diagnosis, treatment, education, and training including sheltered workshops.

Amendments to this Construction Act passed last year added funds for the initial staff and operation of these facilities, extended and increased appropriations for research and demonstration projects to improve education of retarded childiren, and authorized increased annual sums through fiscal year 1969 for training teachers of the retarded.

The Welfare Administration administers a public assistance program to aid needy families to support retarded children who are permanently and totally disabled.

In all, a total of 48 programs provide financial assistance for service programs, research and demonstration projects, training, construction, income maintenance, and other assistance programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

To coordinate these activities a Secretary's Committee on Mental Retardation has been formed. Representatives serve on this Committee from each unit of the Department that has a mental retardation program. Mental retardation activities are thus administered as a unified, whole program which has as its objective combating mental retardation with every resource at our disposal. The Committee also keeps in close touch with groups outside the Federal Government concerned with mental retardation programs.

The development of this wide array of service and assistance programs on the Federal level was very gratifying for J. Arthur Trudeau. Yet I know that deep inside he regretted that they did not occur thirty years sooner so that his own son, who is rightfully any father's chief concern, might have been helped. Still I know he was deeply grateful knowing that, at last, many children of succeeding generations might be spared the tragedy of mental retardation.

He also knew that much work still remains to be done. Great gaps still exist in our knowledge of mental retardation. For example, Arthur's son Kenney is one of the 75 per cent of the mentally retarded for whom no cause of their affliction is known. More personnel need to be trained. Many more centers such as the Trudeau Memorial Center, to which this club has given its full support, must be established throughout the Nation.

I can promise that we in Congress will see that adequate funds are made available, but under our Federal partnership system the States must supply the initiative for employing these funds for useful purposes. I am sorry to say that many States have been slow in taking advantage of the assistance available to them.

It is here that service clubs such as Rotary render an invaluable service. By creating public awareness, and through your fund-raising activities to get the Trudeau Center built, your club and others have shown that the people of this State wanted and would support such a center. Such a demonstration was undoubtedly a major factor in securing State interest and assistance for the project. And I am very pleased to see one of Arthur's closest friends, one who has done so much to raise funds for the J. Arthur Trudeau Memorial Center, and my friend, Gene Lascio, here this evening. Gene Lascio raised more money than any other single individual to help build this Center. He is one of the greatest friends the retarded have in our State.

I can only hope that the recent State action is only the first of many activities which Rhode Island will undertake to fight mental retardation. Rhode Island can develop a comprehensive program in this field that could serve as a model to other States.

Certainly J. Arthur Trudeau would be most pleased with this recent turn of events. But restless pioneer that he was, he would urge us on to new frontiers, to cut through new barriers of ignorance and apathy until the goal he sought for twenty-six years was finally achieved. No less than the final elimination of mental retardation on all its fronts would have satisfied him—no less I am sure will satisfy us.

Commendation to Minnesota Future Farmer of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota Future Farmers of America organization is one of the best organized and most active in the Nation. I would like to commend the young men taking part in the many programs as well as Mr.

W. J. Kortsemaki, Minnesota Future Farmers of America executive secretary.

The Minnesota FFA has begun an exciting statewide wildlife habitat program which has received support from sportsmen's club, the Minnesota State Conservation Department, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service.

FFA members are to be congratulated for taking part in many programs: First, Operation Coverup in which the FFA helped to screen 15 to 20 dumpgrounds and junkyards by tree plantings. Second, keep Minnesota clean and scenic. Third, trash-burner program in which members construct rubbish burners in their farm shops and make them available to local communities. Fourth, raising ducks and pheasants as well as distribution of the birds. Fifth, cooperating with the Farmers Union in their Green Thumb and debris depository program. Sixth, nearly half of the 40 school forests in Minnesota are managed or operated by FFA members.

For these and other successful programs, the Minnesota Future Farmers of America members are to be congratulated.

Horton Salutes Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the week of August 20 through 27 has been designated as National Drum Corps Week. I would like to take the time today to honor the many thousands of organizations throughout the country who participate in this colorful, vibrant, lyrical activity.

These events are attracting many more enthusiasts each year. Drum corps events in my congressional district always draw capacity crowds. Rochester is the home of the fabulous Grey Knights-Crusaders, currently national champions in the senior division of the American Legion competition.

And there are smaller, less-heralded groups which through the interest they instill in new drum corps members, give youngsters a worthwhile pursuit to occupy their usually idle hours. More than one youth who might have taken a wrong turn along the way and ended up in trouble with the law has, instead, been caught up by a new-found interest in music and marching.

No one can resist the temptation to watch a snappy, precision-trained drum and bugle corps while its members step through their routines. Their activity is clean, healthy, rigid and exacting. The participants learn quickly the need for cooperation, self-discipline and reliability.

The competition is inspiring to a young mind, and the many public performances teach poise.

The fife and drum are part of the heritage of this country, and they are experiencing a rebirth in the spirit of drum corps.

Drum Corps Week 1966 will be a time for all Americans to salute the efforts of those who are working in behalf of these organizations throughout the Nation.

Santa Clara, Calif., Swim Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Santa Clara, Calif., Swim Club in producing champions over past years has been nothing short of fantastic and has served as a remarkable tribute to a wonderful coach and fine leader, George Haines.

Last Sunday the Santa Clara team won the team title for the third consecutive year at the 16th National AAU swimming and diving championships at Lincoln, Nebr.

Don Schollander, a former Olympic champion trained by the Santa Clara coach, made a comeback after a year's inactivity due to mononucleosis and set records in the 400-meter and 200-meter freestyle.

Dick Roth, also of Santa Clara, established a record in the 400-meter individual medley and his teammate, Greg Buckingham, smashed records in the 200-meter individual medley. Miss Claudia Kolb, also of Santa Clara, set a new mark in the women's 200-meter individual medley.

Mr. Speaker, I am most proud to represent the area in which the Santa Clara Swim Club is located. I know of the countless hours early in the morning and late in the evening which Coach Haines and his squad devote to attaining perfection. They are not paid, but merely pursue their sport for the personal satisfaction gained from it. This fine group of Americans has contributed much and is still contributing to a clean, wholesome sport which builds better citizens.

North Dakota Band and Choir—Ambassadors of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the International Peace Garden Tour Band and Choir of Dunseith, N. Dak., recently returned from a trip to Europe with several awards from its outstanding musical achievements.

The band, under the direction of Dr. Merton Utgaard, received among these awards, two of very special significance. They were awarded first place in the Fifth Annual World Music Festival held at Kerkrade, Holland. In recognition of its superior performances at the festival in which over 250 organizations throughout the world participated, they were awarded a gold medal and a scroll for outstanding achievement.

The band also presented a concert in Brussels, Belgium, at which they received the medal of Brussels. This award is given only on rare occasions for an extraordinary performance.

Mr. President, I believe this represents the best form of good will. These young people from several States in the Union literally built a bridge of friendship through their musical talents.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 25, 1966

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our salvation: to Thee we lift our hearts in prayer, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite hearts.

Help us in all things to be masters of ourselves that we may be servants of all.

May those here called to administer the affairs of this land of our love and hope, remembering whose servants they are, make daily choice of spiritual integrity amid the corruption that is in the world through the lust of selfish power that, being unafraid, they may contend steadfastly for the right as Thou dost give them to see the right.

In our private lives and in our public service, help us this and every day to live more nearly as we pray.

"God of justice, save our people
From the clash of race and creed.
From the strife of class and faction
Make our Nation free indeed.

Keep her faith in simple goodness,
Strong as when her life began:
Till it finds its full fruition
In the brotherhood of man."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator