A grandfather six times now, he tells of meeting his wife while studying medicine during the 20s in Berlin.

"She met me, captivated me and now we 40 years married."

She shared his hard times with him and tells of coming home from work in a factory to find him crying after they came to America in 1950.

"I was an old man already and had spoken seven languages but I could not learn English," explains the doctor. "My wife was making straw hats and eyeglasses frames for a living and I couldn't work at my profession until I master the language. After a few months I feel my brain begin to click."

The suffering of his captive fellow citizens in Lithuania still drives Dr. Jasaitis. He pointed out a passage from a prayer book written by four young Catholic girls while in a Siberian prison as symbolic of his country's suffering.

"Mary, save the land woven with blood and tears, with self-sacrifice, resolutions and love.

"Mary, awaken in our breasts the strength of giants. Preserve the pure spirit of our nation, cherished by our forefathers through the ages.

"Mary, enlighten those who have wandered astray, intercede for the souls of the freedom-fighters.

"Raise up our holy Lithuania that it may radiate and shine like a splendid star to glorify you and your Son's boundless mercy and love. Amen."

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Times, July 22, 1966]

THIS IS CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—IN MEMORIAM: EAST GERMANY

The Communists as usual broke the Treaty. East Germany also became a Captive Nation. They built The Wall. Many of our people jumping the wall to freedom were killed. They would rather be Dead than Red.

Published in the interest of freedom by Midtown Tampa Kiwanis Club.

TV COVERAGE, FRIDAY, JULY 22, 1966

WTVT-TV: Tampa Bay topics, 1:25-1:30 P.M.

Civic affairs program, discussion of "Captive Nations" by Michael J. Miklas with guest, Lithuanian freedom fighter, Dr. Domas Jasaitis.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, July 23, 1966]

THIS IS CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—IN MEMORIAM: CHINA

We were told that they were agrarian reformers but they stole the land from our farmers. They slaughtered the patriots. Millions are dead from starvation. China truly is a Captive Nation because it is a Communist Nation.

Published in the interest of freedom by Midtown Tampa Kiwanis Club.

TV COVERAGE

Sunday, July 24, 1966

WFLA-TV: 12:30-1:00 p.m., "History in the Making."

International affairs news analysis program with panel discussion of "Captive Nations Week" by panelists, Prof. Carlos Weyman, Col. John Lindenmeyer and Michael J. Miklas.

TV COVERAGE

WFLA-TV, WLCY-TV, WSUN-TV, WTVT-TV: Each day during the week, the stations used a slide of the captive nation being remembered on that day with accompanying 10- and 20-second spot announcements.

Sunday: Rumania.
Monday: Cuba.
Tuesday: Poland.
Wednesday: Czechoslovakia.
Thursday: Hungary.
Friday: East Germany.
Saturday: China.

RADIO COVERAGE

WFLA, WINQ, WDAE, WSOL, WALT, WHBO, WSUN, WLCY: Each day during the week the stations presented 30-second spot announcements about the nation being remembered that day.

Sunday: Rumania.
Monday: Cuba.
Tuesday: Poland.
Wednesday: Czechoslovakia.
Thursday: Hungary.
Friday: East Germany.
Saturday: China.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—REPRINTING OF SPEECHES

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, under the direction of the National Captive Nations Committee at 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036, the 1966 Captive Nations Week observance was a phenomenal success. With the aid of member bodies, such as the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and interested groups, the chairman of NCNC, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is also professor of economics at Georgetown University, has undertaken the compiling and editing of selected observance items to provide a broad spectrum of the week's activities.

It is intended that all of the addresses on the 1966 Captive Nations Week observance which were delivered and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to, during, and since the week be reprinted. If any Member objects to the reprinting of his remarks, it is requested that he contact Mr. Raymond F. Noyes, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk, room H-112 in the Capitol, within the next week. This announcement is being made in order to comply with the rules of reprinting remarks from the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow, Thursday, October 6, 1966.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 5, 1966:

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

Stanley B. Gregory, Wilton, Conn., in place of R. J. Brereton, retired.

Warren M. Bloomberg, Baltimore, Md., in place of W. F. Laukaitis, retired.

Frank W. Foslien, Garfield, Minn., in place of G. E. Roche, deceased.

George H. Patterson, Braymer, Mo., in place of L. B. Kincaid, retired.

George F. Carpenter, Charlotte, N.C., in place of E. H. Thomas, resigned.

Robert F. Ebenal, Woodburn, Oreg., in place of P. A. Mills, retired.

Charles F. Sutton, Newtown, Pa., in place of R. S. Burns, deceased.

James R. Bennett, Blackstock, S.C., in place of K. M. Kennedy, retired.

Essie M. Eller, Hickory Grove, S.C., in place of B. H. Maybin, retired.

Juanita A. Tuttle, Craigsville, Va., in place of M. T. Daniel, retired.

Lawrence T. Murphy, Elma, Wash., in place of J. F. Ladley, retired.

Donald C. Arnaud, Zenith, Wash., in place of L. B. Kelly, resigned.

Loreida F. Hedger, Charmco, W. Va., in place of J. E. Forbes, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1966

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

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

My help cometh from the Lord, who made heaven and earth.—Psalm 121: 2.

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly pray that we may always be a people mindful of Thy favor, eager to do Thy will, and glad to be of service to our fellow man.

Save us from discord and discrimination, from pride and prejudice, from vindictiveness and violence, and lead us into the glorious liberty of those who put their trust in Thee, and who walk in the way of Thy commandments.

Give us wisdom to know Thy will, and the strength to do it. Fill us all with the love of truth and righteousness and good will, that we may be a blessing to our Nation and in turn our Nation be a blessing to our world. In the dear Redeemer's name we pray. 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 without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5912. An act for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band; and

H.R. 9916. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 1511. An act to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty; and

H.R. 16646. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of exemplary rehabilitation certificates to certain individuals after considering their character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

House to bills of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3433. An act to make it a criminal offense to steal, embezzle, or otherwise unlawfully take property from a pipeline, 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. 8126) entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement."

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

S. 3834. An act to amend chapter 141 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for price adjustments in contracts for the procurement of milk by the Department of Defense; and

S.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

SACRIFICE FOR THE WAR IN VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, although we have not declared war in Vietnam, few would argue the point that the United States is at war. And wartime is the time for discipline. One of the greatest problems facing our country today is inflation, and this problem will increase as we try to fight a war in Asia and at the same time attempt to take care of everyone from the cradle to the grave through a multitude of giveaway programs. During the World Wars, we expended great sums of money in order to win. Everyone realized that it was necessary to sacrifice to protect our national security. Some inflation occurred, but it was held to a minimum by shelving the giveaway programs.

I have consistently backed the war effort in Vietnam as a necessary part of the American tradition of liberty and independence. On the other hand, I have also consistently voted against do-gooder legislation that we presently cannot afford. Rich and poor alike must stand together and be happy with what we have for the moment. Otherwise the inflationary trend of the war is going to continue, and the price of groceries is going to continue to soar. I feel that I am doing all that I can in opposing giveaway legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I implore the other Members of Congress to do likewise. We must think of the workingman. It is in his interest that we halt this inflationary trend that is decreasing his buying power.

CREDIT TERMS FOR NATIONS TRADING WITH CUBA OR NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. FINDLEY. 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. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the food-for-peace legislation which will be before the House today, U.S. taxpayers offer extremely liberal credit terms—only three-fourths of 1 percent interest for 2 years, and only 2½ percent for the balance of 20 years, in addition to soft-currency sales which are tantamount to donations.

The purpose of the Republican amendment is to deny these fancy cut-rate terms to any nation that trades with either Cuba or North Vietnam.

India is trading with Cuba, and is getting food-for-peace aid.

Yugoslavia is trading with North Vietnam, and is getting subsidized credit under food-for-peace.

Poland is trading with North Vietnam, and, early this year, helped to organize at the Communist conference in Cuba worldwide aid for North Vietnam. Promoters are trying to work out a food-for-peace deal for Poland.

Egypt is trading with North Vietnam, has received millions in food aid, and is currently pressing hard for more.

No U.S. citizen can today borrow money at three-fourths of 1 percent, or even at 2½ percent—and no U.S. citizen should be required to help finance terms like that for any country that trades with Cuba or North Vietnam.

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVE DADDARIO

Mr. MONAGAN. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and privilege for me to announce to the House the election of our colleague, Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO as a member of the Executive Committee of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. His election took place on Tuesday at the meeting in Tehran and was not only a tribute to Mr. DADDARIO personally, but also constituted a very satisfactory achievement for the United States, since he received the highest number of votes in a contested election and support came to him from countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

It is a great satisfaction for me to see this well-deserved honor come to my friend and I know that the House will be gratified to know that the United States will have such an able spokesman in this great international body.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 333]

Albert	Gettys	Schisler
Anderson, Ill.	Grider	Scott
Andrews, Glenn	Gross	Sickles
Ashley	Harvey, Ind.	Sisk
Aspinall	Hébert	Stanton
Bray	Hull	Steed
Brock	Jones, N.C.	Stephens
Brown, Calif.	Leggett	Stratton
Callaway	Long, La.	Sweeney
Celler	McMillan	Thomas
Conte	Martin, Ala.	Thompson, Tex.
Conyers	Martin, Mass.	Todd
Corman	Martin, Nebr.	Toll
Craley	Morris	Tuck
Cramer	Morrison	Walker, Miss.
Cunningham	Morton	Walker, N. Mex.
Dulski	Murray	Watkins
Duncan, Oreg.	O'Konski	Watson
Dyal	Olsen, Mont.	White, Idaho
Edwards, Ala.	O'Neill, Mass.	Whitten
Evans, Colo.	Powell	Widnall
Farnsley	Purcell	Willis
Fisher	Reinecke	Wilson, Charles H.
Flynt	Rivers, Alaska	
Foley	Rogers, Tex.	
	Roncalio	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 356 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

NEW THREAT IN MIDDLE EAST

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, a little-publicized and almost unnoticed attempt by the Chinese Communists to promote an attack on Israel should be closely watched by the U.S. Government. If this attempt should come near to succeeding, it could result in a spread of the current Vietnam conflict that could embroil nations other than Israel.

The so-called Palestine Liberation Army, under command of Achmed Sheekairy is being financed by a grant from Peking. Recently there have been increased shipments of military supplies to Sheekairy's forces based in Syria and Egypt. At the same time members of that army are receiving military training in Hanoi, with an emphasis on guerrilla warfare.

It seems clear that the Communist Chinese have a strong interest in fomenting trouble between Arabs and the Israelis. An outbreak of hostilities would

not only present the grave danger of a major conflict in the Middle East, but would serve to tie down our naval forces in the Mediterranean and our reserves in the Near East.

We cannot permit any extension of a Vietnam-type conflict into that area. The pattern of stirring up strife is a familiar one where the Chinese are concerned, and the danger in this case is clear and present. The United States would do well to make it clear in advance that we will not stand idle if the peace of Israel is menaced, but will take effective countermeasures as the need arises.

AMENDING PROVISIONS OF LAW CONCERNING RELATIONSHIP OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY TO THE ARMY AND NAVY TO APPLY WITH SIMILAR EFFECT TO THE AIR FORCE

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 722) to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force, 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:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 16 of the Act of May 22, 1917, chapter 20, as amended (33 U.S.C. 855, 858), is amended as follows:

"(1) The first paragraph (33 U.S.C. 855) is amended to read as follows:

"'The President is authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to transfer to the service and jurisdiction of a military department such vessels, equipment, stations, and commissioned officers of the Environmental Science Services Administration as he may deem to the best interest of the country, and after such transfer all expenses connected therewith shall be defrayed out of the appropriations for the department to which transfer is made: *Provided*, That such vessels, equipment, stations, and commissioned officers shall be returned to the Environmental Science Services Administration when such national emergency ceases, in the opinion of the President, and nothing in this section shall be construed as transferring the Environmental Science Services Administration or any of its functions from the Department of Commerce except in time of national emergency and to the extent herein provided: *Provided, further*, That any of the commissioned officers of the Environmental Science Services Administration who may be transferred as provided in this section, shall, while under the jurisdiction of a military department, have proper military status and shall be subject to the laws, regulations, and orders for the government of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, as the case may be, insofar as the same may be applicable to persons whose retention permanently in the military service of the United States is not contemplated by law.'

"(2) The last paragraph (33 U.S.C. 858) is amended to read as follows:

"'The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Commerce shall jointly prescribe regulations governing the duties to be performed by the Environmental Science Services Administration in time of war, and for the cooperation of that service with the military departments in time of peace in preparation for its duties in war, which regulations shall not be effective unless approved by each of those Secretaries, and included therein may be rules and regulations for making reports and communications between a military department and the Environmental Science Services Administration.'

"SEC. 2. Section 10 of the Act of January 19, 1942, chapter 6, as amended (33 U.S.C. 868a), is amended to read as follows:

"'Commissioned officers, ships' officers, and members of the crews of vessels of the Environmental Science Services Administration shall be permitted to purchase commissary and quartermaster supplies as far as available from the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps at the prices charged officers and enlisted men of those services.'

"SEC. 3. Section 1 of the Act of December 3, 1942, chapter 670, as amended (33 U.S.C. 854a-1), is amended to read as follows:

"'Personnel of the Environmental Science Services Administration shall be subject in like manner and to the same extent as personnel of the Navy to all laws authorizing temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers in time of war or national emergency subject to the following limitations:

"'(1) Commissioned officers in the service of a military department, under the provisions of section 16 of the Act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 87), as amended, may, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the military department concerned, be temporarily promoted to higher ranks or grades.

"'(2) Commissioned officers in the service of the Environmental Science Services Administration may be temporarily promoted to fill vacancies in ranks and grades caused by the transfer of commissioned officers to the service and jurisdiction of a military department under the provisions of section 16 of the Act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 87), as amended.

"'(3) Temporary appointments may be made in all grades to which original appointments in the Environmental Science Services Administration are authorized: *Provided*, That the number of officers holding temporary appointments shall not exceed the number of officers transferred to a military department under the provisions of section 16 of the Act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 87), as amended.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Environmental Science Services Administration to the Army and Navy so they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MUSEUM ACT OF 1965

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1310) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2176)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1310) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, 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 amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'National Museum Act of 1965'.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Director of the National Museum under the direction of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall—

"(1) cooperate with museums and their professional organizations in a continuing study of museum problems and opportunities, both in the United States and abroad;

"(2) prepare and carry out programs for training career employees in museum practices in cooperation with museums and their professional organizations, wheresoever these may best be conducted;

"(3) prepare and distribute significant museum publications;

"(4) perform research on, and otherwise contribute to, the development of museum techniques;

"(5) cooperate with departments and agencies of the Government of the United States operating, assisting, or otherwise concerned with museums; and

"(6) report annually to the Congress on progress in these activities.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, not to exceed $200,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and in each subsequent fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"SEC. 3. The first paragraph under the heading 'National Museum' contained in the Act of July 7, 1884 (23 Stat. 214; 20 U.S.C. 65), is amended by deleting the following sentence: 'And the Director of the National Museum is hereby directed to report annually to the Congress the progress of the museum during the year and its present condition.'."

And the House agree to the same.

PAUL C. JONES,
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLAIBORNE PELL,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
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 amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1310) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause

and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The difference between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference is noted in the following outline, except for minor technical and clerical changes.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Subsection (b) of section 2 of the Senate bill authorizes not to exceed $200,000 per fiscal year to carry out this act.

The House amendment struck out subsection (b) of section 2 of the Senate bill, thus providing unlimited authority for appropriations to carry out this act.

The proposed conference substitute authorizes not to exceed the following sums to carry out this act: $200,000 for fiscal year 1968, $250,000 for fiscal year 1969, $250,000 for fiscal year 1970, and $300,000 for fiscal year 1971. These limitations would apply to the new activities to be undertaken by the Smithsonian Institution pursuant to the provisions of this act. The conferees did not authorize appropriations for fiscal years after 1971 since no projections of expenditures were available beyond that date, and the conferees believe that Congress should periodically reexamine this program. Thus, further authorizations will be necessary for fiscal years after fiscal year 1971 in order to carry out this act after that date.

PAUL C. JONES,
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Missouri yielding to me. I simply have one question. As I understand the statement of the managers on the part of the House, we acceded to the original provision of paragraph (b) of section 2 of the Senate bill, S. 1310. The effect of this is to encumber a future Congress in increasing amounts as to the purpose of this continuing Smithsonian Institution authority. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Well, that is perfectly correct. In other words we acceded to them to accept a limitation. Rather than $200,000, it goes up to a maximum of $300,000 and they would then have to come back to the Congress for reappraisal.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, in this time of deficit spending, in this time of war, and in this time when the President is telling us to hold back on further expenses, to say nothing of encumbering future Congresses; will the gentleman from Missouri please tell the House in a few brief words why it was necessary to recede from the House position and accede to the Senate with respect to future expenditures in this area?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I might say to the gentleman the reason why we did this was because we were just outvoted, to be perfectly frank with you. However, I think the limitation of $200,000 for the first year would not have any effect on the bill itself. Of course, all of these will be subject to review by the Committee on Appropriations each year and after it has been operated for 3 years they would have to come back to the Congress for reappraisal.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, what I am worried about is not $200,000 for fiscal year 1968 but the $250,000 for fiscal year 1969 and the $250,000 for fiscal year 1970 and the $300,000 for fiscal year 1971. This is backdoor spending. I presume that is based and predicated on the continuation of inflation and mounting Government expense as well as that of the need of the Smithsonian Institution to make long-range commitments. However, it does encumber a future Congress and, in fact, the next two Congresses, as far as these amounts are concerned. In the opinion of my colleague from Missouri, was this a worthwhile sacrifice in order to stipulate review by the committee at the end of these fiscal years?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I might say that we had to reach some compromise on the wording of the bill or we would not have had any bill. The House version was an open-end commitment, while the Senate placed a limitation of $200,000 per year. Our committee felt that this was a worthwhile activity and we felt there was sufficient consideration by the Congress when it does come before the Committee on Appropriations. So I think it is safeguarded in that respect.

Mr. HALL. We constantly hear about an authorizing bill not being valid when it comes before the Committee on Appropriations, but I submit that when the appropriation bill is brought up the argument is invariably advanced that the operative committee members have to appropriate, or they have to provide ways and means by some method or manner for everything that has been previously authorized by the legislative committee of the House. I hope that in the future the managers on the part of the House will not seek to encumber a future Congress whose membership might be drastically changed.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and for giving me the opportunity of making this legislative record.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAVING FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY IN VIETNAM BY DESTROYING THE WORLD

Mr. FARBSTEIN. 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. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, former President Eisenhower belies his reputation as a man of moderation and caution by his apparent advocacy of the nuclear threat in Vietnam. The former Commander in Chief seems to be saying that he would risk a global holocaust to achieve our limited aims in southeast Asia. If we follow the Eisenhower dictum, it seems to me, we would be saving freedom and democracy in Vietnam by destroying the world.

Mr. Speaker, in these days when we are imploring other nations to forgo nuclear arms, Mr. Eisenhower suggests that we rattle our own weapons to strike fear in the enemies' hearts. Our only hope for halting proliferation is to demonstrate just how responsible we can be in our nuclear policies. Mr. Eisenhower does this country a serious disservice by proposing that we use our nuclear power where it suits us—and the rest of world be damned.

I condemn that viewpoint. We deserve the world's confidence only if we show we are capable of the utmost restraint in exercising our nuclear strength. I am certain our President and those others in authority will make evident to the people of this Nation and the world that the mere thought of the use of nuclear arms is repulsive to this enlightened Nation.

AMEND FEDERAL SEED ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 15662) to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended, 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 2, line 19, strike out "of" where it appears the second time and insert "for".

Page 3, line 9, strike out "Stated:'" and insert "Stated':".

Page 3, line 12, strike out "label."" and insert "label;".".

Page 3, line 20, strike out "1571(B))" and insert "1571(b))".

Page 4, line 13, strike out "The" and insert "the".

Page 8, line 17, strike out "noxious weed" and insert "noxious-weed".

Page 10, line 3, after "12." insert "(a)".

Page 10, line 19, strike out ""(b)" and insert "(b)".

Page 10, line 21, strike out "'(e)" and insert "(e)".

Page 11, line 8, strike out "stated.'" and insert "stated.".

Page 11, line 11, strike out "Any" and insert "any".

Page 11, line 23, strike out "Any" and insert "any".

Page 14, line 16, strike out "pure-live" and insert "live".

Page 14, line 20, after "time" insert "to time".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT, AS AMENDED, TO STRENGTHEN AND EXPAND FOOD SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill, S. 3467,

"An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children," 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2063)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3467) to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, 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 amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Child Nutrition Act of 1966'.

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. In recognition of the demonstrated relationship between food and good nutrition and the capacity of children to develop and learn, based on the years of cumulative successful experience under the national lunch program with its significant contributions in the field of applied nutrition research, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that these efforts shall be extended, expanded, and strengthened under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture as a measure to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children, and to encourage the domestic consumption of agricultural and other foods, by assisting States through grants-in-aid and other means, to meet more effectively the nutritional needs of our children.

"SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not to exceed $110,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not to exceed $115,000,000; and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years not to exceed $120,000,000, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes of this section 'United States' means the fifty States and the District of Columbia. The Secretary shall administer the special milk program provided for by this section to the maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he administered the special milk program provided for by Public Law 85-478, as amended, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966.

"SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 4 (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not to exceed $7,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not to exceed $10,000,000, to enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out, on a nonpartisan basis, a pilot program to assist States through grants-in-aid and other means, to initiate, maintain, or expand nonprofit breakfast programs in schools.

"APPORTIONMENT TO STATES

"(b) Of the funds appropriated for the purposes of this section, the Secretary shall for each fiscal year, (1) apportion $2,600,000 equally among the States other than Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and $45,000 equally among Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and (2) apportion the remainder among the States in accordance with the apportionment formula contained in section 4 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended.

"STATE DISBURSEMENT TO SCHOOLS

"(c) Funds apportioned and paid to any State for the purpose of this section shall be disbursed by the State educational agency to schools selected by the State educational agency, to reimburse such schools for the cost of obtaining agricultural and other foods for consumption by needy children in a breakfast program and for the purpose of subsection (d). Such food costs may include, in addition to the purchase price, the cost of processing, distributing, transporting, storing, and handling. Disbursement to schools shall be made at such rates per meal or on such other basis as the Secretary shall prescribe. In selecting schools, the State educational agency shall, to the extent practicable, give first consideration to those schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and to those schools to which a substantial proportion of the children enrolled must travel long distances daily.

"(d) In circumstances of severe need where the rate per meal established by the Secretary is deemed by him insufficient to carry on an effective breakfast program in a school, the Secretary may authorize financial assistance up to 80 per centum of the operating costs of such a program, including cost of obtaining, preparing, and serving food. In the selection of schools to receive assistance under this section, the State educational agency shall require applicant schools to provide justification of the need for such assistance.

"NUTRITIONAL AND OTHER PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

"(e) Breakfast served by schools participating in the school breakfast program under this section shall consist of a combination of foods and shall meet minimum nutritional requirements prescribed by the Secretary on the basis of tested nutritional research. Such breakfasts shall be served without cost or at a reduced cost only to children who are determined by local school authorities to be unable to pay the full cost of the breakfast. In making such determinations, such local authorities should, to the extent practicable, consult with public welfare and health agencies. No physical segregation of or other discrimination against any child shall be made by the school because of his inability to pay.

"NONPROFIT PRIVATE SCHOOLS

"(f) The withholding of funds for and disbursement to nonprofit private schools will be effected in accordance with section 10 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended, exclusive of the matching provisions thereof.

"NONFOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not to exceed $12,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not to exceed $15,000,000, for each of the two fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970, not to exceed $18,000,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize, to enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out a program to assist the States through grants-in-aid and other means to supply schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist with equipment, other than land or buildings, for the storage, preparation, transportation, and serving of food to enable such schools to establish, maintain, and expand school food service programs. In the case of nonprofit private schools, such equipment shall be for use of such schools principally in connection with child feeding programs authorized in this Act and in the National School Lunch Act, as amended, and in the event such equipment is no longer so used, that part of such equipment financed with Federal funds, or the residual value thereof, shall revert to the United States.

"APPORTIONMENTS TO STATES

"(b) The Secretary shall apportion the funds appropriated for the purposes of this section among the States during each fiscal year on the same basis as apportionments are made under section 4 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended, for supplying agricultural and other foods, except that apportionment to American Samoa for any fiscal year shall be on the same basis as the apportionment to the other States. Payments to any State of funds apportioned for any fiscal year shall be made upon condition that at least one-fourth of the cost of any equipment financed under this subsection shall be borne by State or local funds.

"STATE DISBURSEMENT TO SCHOOLS

"(c) Funds apportioned and paid to any State for the purpose of this section shall be disbursed by the State educational agency to assist schools, which draw attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and which have no, or grossly inadequate, equipment, to conduct a school food service program, and to acquire such equipment. In the selection of schools to receive assistance under this section, the State educational agency shall require applicant schools to provide justification of the need for such assistance and the inability of the school to finance the food service equipment needed. Disbursements to any school may be made, by advances or reimbursements, only after approval by the State educational agency of a request by the school for funds, accompanied by a detailed description of the equipment to be acquired and the plans for the use thereof in effectively meeting the nutritional needs of children in the school.

"NONPROFIT PRIVATE SCHOOLS

"(d) The withholding of funds for and disbursement to nonprofit private schools will be effected in accordance with section 10 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended, exclusive of the matching provision thereof.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 6. The Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time the amounts to be paid to any State under sections 3 through 7 of this Act and the time or times such amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State at the time or times fixed by the Secretary the amounts so certified.

"STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"SEC. 7. The Secretary may utilize funds appropriated under this section for advances to each State educational agency for use for its administrative expenses in supervising and giving technical assistance to the local school districts in their conducting of programs under this Act. Such funds shall be advanced only in amounts and to

the extent determined necessary by the Secretary to assist such State agencies in the administration of additional activities undertaken by them under section 11 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended, and sections 4 and 5 of this Act. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

"UTILIZATION OF FOODS

"SEC. 8. Each school participating under section 4 of this Act shall, insofar as practicable, utilize in its program foods designated from time to time by the Secretary as being in abundance, either nationally or in the school area, or foods donated by the Secretary. Foods available under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 1058), as amended, or purchased under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, or section 709 of the Food and Agriculture Act by 1966 (79 Stat. 1212), may be donated by the Secretary to schools in accordance with the needs as determined by local school authorities, for utilization in their feeding programs under this Act.

"NONPROFIT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 9. The food and milk service programs in schools and nonprofit institutions receiving assistance under this Act shall be conducted on a nonprofit basis.

"REGULATIONS

"SEC. 10. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out this Act.

"PROHIBITIONS

"SEC. 11. (a) In carrying out the provisions of sections 3 through 5 of this Act, neither the Secretary nor the State shall impose any requirement with respect to teaching personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, and materials of instruction.

"(b) The value of assistance to children under this Act shall not be considered to be income or resources for any purpose under any Federal or State laws including, but not limited to, laws relating to taxation, welfare, and public assistance programs. Expenditures of funds from State and local sources for the maintenance of food programs for children shall not be diminished as a result of funds received under this Act.

"PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 12. The Secretary may extend the benefits of all school feeding programs conducted and supervised by the Department of Agriculture to include preschool programs operated as part of the school system.

"CENTRALIZATION OF ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 13. Authority for the conduct and supervision of Federal programs to assist schools in providing food service programs for children is assigned to the Department of Agriculture. To the extent practicable, other Federal agencies administering programs under which funds are to be provided to schools for such assistance shall transfer such funds to the Department of Agriculture for distribution through the administrative channels and in accordance with the standards established under this Act and the National School Lunch Act.

"SEC. 14. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to the Secretary for his administrative expense under this Act.

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS AND DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 15. For the purposes of this Act—

"(a) 'State' means any of the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, or American Samoa.

"(b) 'State educational agency' means, as the State legislature may determine, (1) the chief State school officer (such as the State superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar officer), or (2) a board of education controlling the State department of education.

"(c) 'Nonprofit private school' means any private school exempt from income tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(d) 'School' means any public or nonprofit private school of high school grade or under, including kindergarten and preschool programs operated by such school and, with respect to Puerto Rico, shall also include nonprofit child-care centers certified as such by the Governor of Puerto Rico.

"(e) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

"ACCOUNTS AND RECORDS

"SEC. 16. States, State educational agencies, schools, and nonprofit institutions participating in programs under this Act shall keep such accounts and records as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to determine whether there has been compliance with this Act and the regulations hereunder. Such accounts and records shall at all times be available for inspection and audit by representatives of the Secretary and shall be preserved for such period of time, not in excess of three years, as the Secretary determines is necessary."

And the House agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
HARLAN HAGEN,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
PAGE BELCHER,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
CATHERINE MAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
B. EVERETT JORDAN,
GEORGE MCGOVERN,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
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 amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3467) to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of S. 3467 and substituted the language of H.R. 13361 to establish a cooperative Federal-State child nutrition program under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, as passed by the House.

The Senate conferees agreed to the entire House amendment with the exception of two provisions which were added to the House bill on the floor. The first provision added the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to the areas covered by the bill. The second provision would have authorized appropriations to extend to children attending overseas dependents schools administered by the Department of Defense the benefits of this Act and of the National School Lunch Act.

The conferees felt that the administration of both of these provisions would be extremely difficult and also, with respect to the extension of feeding programs to overseas dependents schools, that this involved matters of substantive legislation and policy affecting not only this Act but the National School Lunch Act and, therefore, should be the subject of separate legislative consideration.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
HARLAN HAGEN,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
PAGE BELCHER,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
CATHERINE MAY,
Managers on the Part of House.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve as a conferee with respect to the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, and I feel this is indeed a highly constructive piece of legislation.

This measure is unique in that it blends innovation with prudence, thereby providing the assurance that the ultimate benefactor of the legislation will be the children of America.

It is important to note that this legislation does not in any manner change the school lunch program. It will permit this program to work in the future just as it has in the past and at the level of appropriation set by the Congress.

The Child Nutrition Act, then, adds to the school lunch program. It provides for the continuation of the special milk program for an additional 3 years, the program through which milk at reduced prices is made available to children in schools, summer camps, and similar institutions.

In addition, the measure provides for two new programs. The first, the school breakfast program, would be carried out in substantially the same manner that the schools are now carrying out the lunch and milk programs. I would like to point out, however, that our committee had a great many reservations about going into this new area on anything but an experimental basis, because we wanted to see proof that the program could be wisely and practically applied. We committee members also wanted to be sure that this approach did not in any manner or means interfere with the established school lunch program. It was for that reason that the program was put on a strictly 2-year pilot program.

The second new program would provide schools in low-income areas with funds to acquire equipment for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, and expanding school food service programs. This part of the program will be carried out on a cost-sharing basis with the State and local areas, and it will bring the school food service into areas where children are most in need of it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good program, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure

to know that I have had some small part in seeing it come into being.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO CORRECT THE TITLE OF S. 3467

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1028) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 1028

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 3467) to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to correct the title so as to read: "An Act to strengthen and expand food service programs for children."

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, TO COMBAT HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION, TO FURTHER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14929), an act to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the 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. 334]

Addabbo	Callaway	Curtis
Albert	Celler	Duncan, Oreg.
Ashley	Clark	Dyal
Aspinall	Cleveland	Edwards, Ala.
Brock	Corman	Evans, Colo.
Brown, Calif.	Craley	Farnsley
Fisher	Morse	Stephens
Flynt	Morton	Stratton
Fulton, Tenn.	Murray	Sullivan
Grider	O'Konski	Sweeney
Gross	Olsen, Mont.	Teague, Tex.
Grover	O'Neill, Mass.	Thompson, Tex
Halleck	Ottinger	Toll
Harvey, Ind.	Powell	Tuck
Hébert	Purcell	Tunney
Hull	Rees	Tupper
Irwin	Reid, N.Y.	Walker, Miss.
Kupferman	Reinecke	Walker, N. Mex.
Leggett	Resnick	Watkins
McCarthy	Rivers, Alaska	Watson
McMillan	Rogers, Tex.	Weltner
McVicker	Roncalio	White, Idaho
Macdonald	Rosenthal	Widnall
Martin, Ala.	Schisler	Willis
Martin, Mass.	Scott	Wilson, Bob
Martin, Nebr.	Sickles	Wolff
Morris	Sisk	
Morrison	Stanton	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 346 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2075)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14929) to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Food for Peace Act of 1966'.

"SEC. 2. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended—

"(A) By amending section 2 to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to expand international trade; to develop and expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities; to use the abundant agricultural productivity of the United States to combat hunger and malnutrition and to encourage economic development in the developing countries, with particular emphasis on assistance to those countries that are determined to improve their own agricultural production; and to promote in other ways the foreign policy of the United States.'

"(B) By amending title I to read as follows:

"'TITLE I

"'SEC. 101. In order to carry out the policies and accomplish the objectives set forth in section 2 of this Act, the President is authorized to negotiate and carry out agreements with friendly countries to provide for the sale of agricultural commodities for dollars on credit terms or for foreign currencies.

"'SEC. 102. For the purpose of carrying out agreements concluded under this Act the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to finance the sale and exportation of agricultural commodities whether from private stocks or from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"'SEC. 103. In exercising the authorities conferred upon him by this title, the President shall—

"'(a) take into account efforts of friendly countries to help themselves toward a greater degree of self-reliance, including efforts to meet their problems of food production and population growth;

"'(b) take steps to assure a progressive transition from sales for foreign currencies to sales for dollars (or to the extent that transition to sales for dollars under the terms applicable to such sales is not possible, transition to sales for foreign currencies on credit terms no less favorable to the United States than those for development loans made under section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and on terms which permit conversion to dollars at the exchange rate applicable to the sales agreement) at a rate whereby the transition can be completed by December 31, 1971: *Provided*, That provision may be included in any agreement for payment in foreign currencies to the extent that the President determines that such currencies are needed for the purpose of subsections (a), (b), (c), (e), and (h) of section 104;

"'(c) take reasonable precautions to safeguard usual marketings of the United States and to assure that sales under this title will not unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities or normal patterns of commercial trade with friendly countries;

"'(d) make sales agreements only with those countries which he determines to be friendly to the United States: *Provided*, That the President shall periodically review the status of those countries which are eligible under this subsection and report the results of such review to the Congress. As used in this Act, 'friendly country' shall not include (1) any country or area dominated or controlled by a foreign government or organization controlling a world Communist movement, or (2) for the purpose only of sales of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under title I of this Act, any country or area dominated by a Communist government, or (3) for the purpose only of sales of agricultural commodities under title I of this Act any nation which sells or furnishes or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba or North Vietnam (excluding United States installations in Cuba) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition and implements of war, so long as they are governed by a Communist regime, or (4) for the purposes only of sales under title I of this Act the United Arab Republic, unless the President determines that such sale is in the national interest of the United States. No sales to the United Arab Republic shall be based upon the requirements of that nation for more than one fiscal year. The President shall keep the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to sales made to the United Arab Republic under title I of this Act. Notwithstanding any other Act, the President may enter into agreements for the sale of agricultural commodities for dollars on credit terms under title I of this Act with countries which fall within the definition of 'friendly country' for the purpose of such sales and no sales under this Act shall be made with any country if the President finds such country is (a) an aggressor, in a military sense, against any country having diplomatic relations with the United States, or (b) using funds, of any sort, from the United

States for purposes inimical to the foreign policies of the United States;

"'(e) take appropriate steps to assure that private trade channels are used to the maximum extent practicable both with respect to sales from privately owned stocks and with respect to sales from stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation and that small business has adequate and fair opportunity to participate in sales made under the authority of this Act;

"'(f) give special consideration to the development and expansion of foreign markets for United States agricultural commodities, with appropriate emphasis on more adequate storage, handling, and food distribution facilities as well as long-term development of new and expanding markets by encouraging economic growth;

"'(g) obtain commitments from purchasing countries that will prevent resale or transshipment to other countries, or use for other than domestic purposes, of agricultural commodities purchased under this title, without specific approval of the President;

"'(h) obtain rates of exchange applicable to the sale of commodities under such agreements which are not less favorable than the highest of exchange rates legally obtainable in the respective countries and which are not less favorable than the highest of exchange rates obtainable by any other nation;

"'(i) promote progress toward assurance of an adequate food supply by encouraging countries with which agreements are made to give higher emphasis to the production of food crops than to the production of such nonfood crops as are in world surplus;

"'(j) exercise the authority contained in title I of this Act to assist friendly countries to be independent of domination or control by any world Communist movement. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing sales agreements under title I with any government or organization controlling a world Communist movement or with any country with which the United States does not have diplomatic relations;

"'(k) whenever practicable require upon delivery that not less than 5 per centum of the purchase price of any agricultural commodities sold under title I of this Act be payable in dollars or in the types or kinds of currencies which can be converted into dollars;

"'(l) obtain commitments from friendly purchasing countries that will insure, insofar as practicable, that food commodities sold for foreign currencies under title I of this Act shall be marked or identified at point of distribution or sale as being provided on a concessional basis to the recipient government through the generosity of the people of the United States of America, and obtain commitments from purchasing countries to publicize widely to their people, by public media and other means, that the commodities are being provided on a concessional basis through the friendship of the American people as food for peace;

"'(m) require foreign currencies to be convertible to dollars to the extent consistent with the effectuation of the purposes of this Act, but in any event to the extent necessary to (1) permit that portion of such currencies made available for payment of United States obligations to be used to meet obligations or charges payable by the United States or any of its agencies to the government of the importing country or any of its agencies, and (2) in the case of excess currency countries, assure convertibility by sale to American tourists or otherwise, of such additional amount (up to twenty-five per centum of the foreign currencies received pursuant to each agreement entered into after the effective date of the Food for Peace Act of 1966) as may be necessary to cover all normal expenditures of American tourists in the importing country;

"'(n) take maximum precautions to assure that sales for dollars on credit terms under this Act shall not displace any sales of United States agricultural commodities which would otherwise be made for cash dollars.

"'SEC. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may use or enter into agreements with foreign countries or international organizations to use the foreign currencies, including principal and interest from loan repayments, which accrue in connection with sales for foreign currencies under this title for one or more of the following purposes:

"'(a) For payment of United States obligations (including obligations entered into pursuant to other legislation);

"'(b) For carrying out programs of United States Government agencies to—

"'(1) help develop new markets for United States agricultural commodities on a mutually benefiting basis. From sale proceeds and loan repayments under this title not less than the equivalent of 5 per centum of the total sales made each year under this title shall be set aside in the amounts and kinds of foreign currencies specified by the Secretary of Agriculture and made available in advance for use as provided by this paragraph over such period of years as the Secretary of Agriculture determines will most effectively carry out the purpose of this paragraph: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may release such amounts of the foreign currencies so set aside as he determines cannot be effectively used for agricultural market development purposes under this section, except that no release shall be made until the expiration of thirty days following the date on which notice of such proposed release is transmitted by the President to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to the House Committee on Agriculture, if transmitted while Congress is in session, or sixty days following the date of transmittal if transmitted while Congress is not in session. Provision shall be made in sale and loan agreements for the convertibility of such amount of the proceeds thereof (not less than 2 per centum) as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be needed to carry out the purpose of this paragraph in those countries which are or offer reasonable potential of becoming dollar markets for United States agricultural commodities. Such sums shall be converted into the types and kinds of foreign currencies as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph and such sums shall be deposited to a special Treasury account and shall not be made available or expended except for carrying out the provisions of this paragraph. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if sufficient foreign currencies for carrying out the purpose of this paragraph in such countries are not otherwise available, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to enter into agreements with such countries for the sale of agricultural commodities in such amounts as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be adequate and for the use of the proceeds to carry out the purpose of this paragraph. In carrying out agricultural market development activities, nonprofit agricultural trade organizations shall be utilized to the maximum extent practicable. The purpose of this paragraph shall include such representation of agricultural industries as may be required during the course of discussions on trade programs relating either to individual commodities or groups of commodities;

"'(2) finance international educational and cultural exchange activities under the programs authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.);

"'(3) collect, collate, translate, abstract, and disseminate scientific and technological information and conduct research and support scientific activities overseas including programs and projects of scientific cooperation between the United States and other countries such as coordinated research against diseases common to all of mankind or unique to individual regions of the globe, and promote and support programs of medical and scientific research, cultural and educational development, family planning, health, nutrition, and sanitation;

"'(4) acquire by purchase, lease, rental, or otherwise, sites and buildings and grounds abroad, for United States Government use including offices, residence quarters, community and other facilities, and construct, repair, alter, and furnish such buildings and facilities;

"'(5) finance under the direction of the Librarian of Congress, in consultation with the National Science Foundation and other interested agencies, (A) programs outside the United States for the analysis and evaluation of foreign books, periodicals, and other materials to determine whether they would provide information of technical or scientific significance in the United States and whether such books, periodicals, and other materials are of cultural or educational significance, (B) the registry, indexing, binding, reproduction, cataloging, abstracting, translating, and dissemination of books, periodicals, and related materials determined to have such significance; and (C) the acquisition of such books, periodicals, and other materials and the deposit thereof in libraries and research centers in the United States specializing in the areas to which they relate;

"'(c) To procure equipment, materials, facilities, and services for the common defense including internal security;

"'(d) For assistance to meet emergency or extraordinary relief requirements other than requirements for food commodities: *Provided*, That not more than a total amount equivalent to $5,000,000 may be made available for this purpose during any fiscal year;

"'(e) For use to the maximum extent under the procedures established by such agency as the President shall designate for loans to United States business firms (including cooperatives) and branches, subsidiaries, or affiliates of such firms for business development and trade expansion in such countries, including loans for private home construction, and for loans to domestic or foreign firms (including cooperatives) for the establishment of facilities for aiding in the utilization, distribution, or otherwise increasing the consumption of, and markets for, United States agricultural products: *Provided, however*, That no such loans shall be made for the manufacture of any products intended to be exported to the United States in competition with products produced in the United States and due consideration shall be given to the continued expansion of markets for United States agricultural commodities or the products thereof. Foreign currencies may be accepted in repayment of such loans;

"'(f) To promote multilateral trade and agricultural and other economic development, under procedures, established by the President, by loans or by use in any other manner which the President may determine to be in the national interest of the United States, particularly to assist programs of recipient countries designed to promote, increase, or improve food production, processing, distribution, or marketing in food-deficit countries friendly to the United States, for which purpose the President may utilize to the extent practicable the services of nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with and approved by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid: *Provided*, That no such funds may be utilized to promote religious activities;

"'(g) For the purchase of goods or services for other friendly countries;

"'(h) For financing, at the request of such country, programs emphasizing maternal welfare, child health and nutrition, and activities, where participation is voluntary, related to the problems of population growth, under procedures established by the President through any agency of the United States, or through any local agency which he determines is qualified to administer such activities;

"'(i) for paying, to the maximum extent practicable, the costs outside the United States of carrying out the program authorized in section 406 of this Act; and

"'(j) For sale for dollars to United States citizens and nonprofit organizations for travel or other purposes of currencies determined to be in excess of the needs of departments and agencies of the United States for such currencies. The United States dollars received from the sale of such foreign currencies shall be deposited to the account of Commodity Credit Corporation:

Provided, That—

"'(1) Section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, shall apply to currencies used for the purposes specified in subsections (a) and (b),

"'(2) Section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, shall apply to all foreign currencies used for grants under subsections (f) and (g), to not less than 10 per centum of the foreign currencies which accrue pursuant to agreements entered into on or before December 31, 1964, and to not less than 20 per centum in the aggregate of the foreign currencies which accrue pursuant to agreements entered into thereafter: *Provided, however*, That the President is authorized to waive such applicability of section 1415 in any case where he determines that it would be inappropriate or inconsistent with the purposes of this title,

"'(3) No agreement or proposal to grant any foreign currencies (except as provided in subsection (c) of this section), or to use (except pursuant to appropriation Act) any principal or interest from loan repayments under this section shall be entered into or carried out until the expiration of thirty days following the date on which such agreement or proposal is transmitted by the President to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to the House Committee on Agriculture, if transmitted while Congress is in session, or sixty days following the date of transmittal if transmitted while Congress is not in session,

"'(4) Any loan made under the authority of this section shall bear interest at such rate as the President may determine but not less than the cost of funds to the United States Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturity comparable to the maturity of such loans, unless the President shall in specific instances after consultation with the advisory committee established under section 407 designate a different rate:

Provided, further, That paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of the foregoing proviso shall not apply in the case of any nation where the foreign currencies or credits owned by the United States and available for use by it in such nation are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be in excess of the normal requirements of the departments and agencies of the United States for expenditures in such nations for the two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such determination is made. The amount of any such excess shall be devoted to the extent practicable and without regard to paragraph (1) of the foregoing proviso, to the acquisition of sites, buildings, and grounds under paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of this section and to assist such nation in undertaking self-help measures to increase its production of agricultural commodities and its facilities for storage and distribution of such commodities. Assistance under the foregoing provision shall be limited to self-help measures additional to those which would be undertaken without such assistance. Upon the determination by the Secretary of the Treasury that such an excess exists with respect to any nation, the President shall advise the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture of such determination; and shall thereafter report to each such Committee as often as may be necessary to keep such Committee advised as to the extent of such excess, the purposes for which it is used or proposed to be used, and the effects of such use.

"'SEC. 105. Foreign currencies received pursuant to this Act shall be deposited in a special account to the credit of the United States and shall be used only pursuant to section 104, and any department or agency of the Government using any of such currencies for a purpose for which funds have been appropriated shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used. The President shall utilize foreign currencies received pursuant to this Act in such manner as will, to the maximum extent possible, reduce any deficit in the balance of payments of the United States.

"'SEC. 106. (a) Payment by any friendly country for commodities purchased for dollars on credit shall be upon terms as favorable to the United States as the economy of such country will permit. Payment for such commodities shall be in dollars with interest at such rates as the Secretary may determine but not less than the minimum rate required by section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for loans made under that section. Payment may be made in reasonable annual amounts over periods of not to exceed twenty years from the date of the last delivery of commodities in each calendar year under the agreement, except that the date for beginning such annual payment may be deferred for a period not later than two years after such date of last delivery, and interest shall be computed from the date of such last delivery. Delivery of such commodities shall be made in annual installments for not more than ten years following the date of the sales agreement and subject to the availability of the commodities at the time delivery is to be made.

"'(b) Agreements hereunder for the sale of agricultural commodities for dollars on credit terms shall include provisions to assure that the proceeds from the sale of the commodities in the recipient country are used for such economic development purposes as are agreed upon in the sales agreement or any amendment thereto.

"'SEC. 107. (a) It is also the policy of the Congress to stimulate and maximize the sale of United States agricultural commodities for dollars through the private trade and to further the use of private enterprise to the maximum, thereby strengthening the development and expansion of foreign commercial markets for United States agricultural commodities. In furtherance of this policy, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to enter into agreements with foreign and United States private trade for financing the sale of agricultural commodities for export over such periods of time and on such credit terms as the Secretary determines will accomplish the objectives of this section. Any agreement entered into under this section shall provide for the development and execution of projects which will result in the establishment of facilities designed to improve the storage or marketing of agricultural commodities, or which will otherwise stimulate and expand private economic enterprise in any friendly country. Any agreement entered into under this section shall also provide for the furnishing of such security as the Secretary determines necessary to provide reasonable and adequate assurance of payment of the purchase price in dollars with interest at a rate which will as nearly as practicable be equivalent to the average cost of funds to the United States Treasury, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to maturities of credits extended under this section. In no event shall the rate of interest be less than the minimum rate, or the delivery period, deferral of first payment, or term of credit be longer than the maximum term, authorized in section 106. In carrying out this Act, the authority provided in this section for making dollar sales shall be used to the maximum extent practicable.

"'(b) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall take reasonable precautions to safeguard usual marketings of the United States and to avoid displacing any sales of United States agricultural commodities which the Secretary finds and determines would otherwise be made for cash dollars.

"'(c) The Secretary shall obtain commitments from purchasers that will prevent resale or transshipment to other countries, or use for other than domestic purposes, of agricultural commodities purchased under this section.

"'(d) In carrying out this Act, the provisions of sections 102, 103(a), 103(d), 103(e), 103(f), 103(j), 103(k), 110, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 407, 408, and 409 shall be applicable to sales under this section.

"'SEC. 108. The Commodity Credit Corporation may finance ocean freight charges incurred pursuant to agreements for sales for foreign currencies (other than those providing for conversion to dollars as described in section 103(d) of this Act) entered into hereunder only to the extent that such charges are higher (than would otherwise be the case) by reason of a requirement that the commodities be transported in United States-flag vessels. Such agreements shall require the balance of such charges for transportation in United States vessels to be paid in dollars by the nations or organizations with whom such agreements are entered into.

"'SEC. 109. (a) Before entering into agreements with developing countries for the sale of United States agricultural commodities on whatever terms, the President shall consider the extent to which the recipient country is undertaking wherever practicable self-help measures to increase per capita production and improve the means for storage and distribution of agricultural commodities, including:

"'(1) devoting land resources to the production of needed food rather than to the production of nonfood crops—especially nonfood crops in world surplus;

"'(2) development of the agricultural chemical, farm machinery and equipment, transportation and other necessary industries through private enterprise;

"'(3) training and instructing farmers in agricultural methods and techniques;

"'(4) constructing adequate storage facilities;

"'(5) improving marketing and distribution systems;

"'(6) creating a favorable environment for private enterprise and investment, both domestic and foreign, and utilizing available technical know-how;

"'(7) establishing and maintaining Government policies to insure adequate incentives to producers; and

"'(8) establishing and expanding institutions for adaptive agricultural research; and

"'(9) allocating for these purposes sufficient national budgetary and foreign exchange resources (including those supplied

by bilateral, multilateral and consortium aid programs) and local currency resources (resulting from loans or grants to recipient governments of the proceeds of local currency sales).

"'(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, in agreements with nations not engaged in armed conflict against Communist forces or against nations with which the United States has no diplomatic relations, not less than 20 per centum of the foreign currencies set aside for purposes other than those in sections 104 (a), (b), (e), and (j) shall be allocated for the self-help measures set forth in this section.

"'(c) Each agreement entered into under this title shall describe the program which the recipient country is undertaking to improve its production, storage, and distribution of agricultural commodities; and shall provide for termination of such agreement whenever the President finds that such program is not being adequately developed.

"'SEC. 110. Agreements shall not be entered into under this title during any calendar year which will call for an appropriation to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount in excess of $1,900,000,000, plus any amount by which agreements entered into under this title in prior years have called or will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts less than authorized for such prior years.'

"(C) By amending title II to read as follows:

"'TITLE II

"'SEC. 201. The President is authorized to determine requirements and furnish agricultural commodities, on behalf of the people of the United States of America, to meet famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements; to combat malnutrition, especially in children; to promote economic and community development in friendly developing areas; and for needy persons and nonprofit school lunch and preschool feeding programs outside the United States. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the President such agricultural commodities determined to be available under section 401 as he may request.

"'SEC. 202. The President may furnish commodities for the purposes set forth in section 201 through such friendly governments and such agencies, private or public, including intergovernmental organizations such as the world food program and other multilateral organizations in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate. The President shall, to the extent practicable, utilize nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with, and approved by, the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. Insofar as practicable, all commodities furnished hereunder shall be clearly identified by appropriate marking on each package or container in the language of the locality where they are distributed as being furnished by the people of the United States of America. The assistance to needy persons shall insofar as practicable be directed toward community and other self-help activities designed to alleviate the causes of the need for such assistance. Except in the case of emergency, the President shall take reasonable precaution to assure that commodities furnished hereunder will not displace or interfere with sales which might otherwise be made.

"'SEC. 203. The Commodity Credit Corporation may, in addition to the cost of acquisition, pay with respect to commodities made available under this title costs for packaging, enrichment, preservation, and fortification; processing, transportation, handling, and other incidental costs up to the time of their delivery free on board vessels in United States ports; ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry abroad, or, in the case of landlocked countries, transportation from United States ports to designated points of entry abroad; and charges for general average contributions arising out of the ocean transport of commodities transferred pursuant thereto.

"'SEC. 204. Programs of assistance shall not be undertaken under this title during any calendar year which calls for an appropriation of more than $600,000,000 to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for all costs incurred in connection with such programs (including the Corporation's investment in commodities made available) plus any amount by which programs of assistance undertaken under this title in the preceding calendar year have called or will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts less than were authorized for such purpose during such preceding year. In addition to other funds available for such purposes under any other Act, funds made available under this title may be used in an amount not exceeding $7,500,000 annually to purchase foreign currencies accruing under title I of this Act in order to meet costs (except the personnel and administrative costs of cooperating sponsors, distributing agencies, and recipient agencies, and the costs of construction or maintenance of any church owned or operated edifice or any other edifices to be used for sectarian purposes) designed to assure that commodities made available under this title are used to carry out effectively the purposes for which such commodities are made available or to promote community and other self-help activities designed to alleviate the causes of the need for such assistance: *Provided, however,* That such funds shall be used only to supplement and not substitute for funds normally available for such purposes from other non-United States Government sources.

"'SEC. 205. It is the sense of the Congress that the President should encourage other advanced nations to make increased contributions for the purpose of combating world hunger and malnutrition, particularly through the expansion of international food and agricultural assistance programs. It is further the sense of the Congress that as a means of achieving this objective, the United States should work for the expansion of the United Nations World food program beyond its present established goals.'

"(D) By changing the designation 'TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS' to 'TITLE III' and by striking out sections 304, 305, 306, 307, and 308.

"(E) By amending title IV to read as follows:

"'TITLE IV

"'SEC. 401. After consulting with other agencies of the Government affected and within policies laid down by the President for implementing this Act, and after taking into account productive capacity, domestic requirements, farm and consumer price levels, commercial exports, and adequate carryover, the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine the agricultural commodities and quantities thereof available for disposition under this Act, and the commodities and quantities thereof which may be included in the negotiations with each country. No commodity shall be available for disposition under this Act if such disposition would reduce the domestic supply of such commodity below that needed to meet domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture at the time of exportation of such commodity.

"'SEC. 402. The term "agricultural commodity" as used in this Act shall include any agricultural commodity produced in the United States or product thereof produced in the United States: *Provided, however,* That the term "agricultural commodity" shall not include alcoholic beverages, and for the purposes of title II of this Act, tobacco or products thereof. Subject to the availability of appropriations therefor, any domestically produced fishery product may be made available under this Act.

"'SEC. 403. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act including such amounts as may be required to make payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation, to the extent the Commodity Credit Corporation is not reimbursed under sections 104(j) and 105, for its actual costs incurred or to be incurred. In presenting his budget, the President shall classify expenditures under this Act as expenditures for international affairs and finance rather than for agriculture and agricultural resources.

"'SEC. 404. The programs of assistance undertaken pursuant to this Act shall be directed toward the attainment of the humanitarian objectives and national interest of the United States.

"'SEC. 405. The authority and funds provided by this Act shall be utilized in a manner that will assist friendly countries that are determined to help themselves toward a greater degree of self-reliance in providing enough food to meet the needs of their people and in resolving their problems relative to population growth.

"'SEC. 406. (a) In order to further assist friendly developing countries to become self-sufficient in food production, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"'(1) To establish and administer through existing agencies of the Department of Agriculture a program of farmer-to-farmer assistance between the United States and such countries to help farmers in such countries in the practical aspects of increasing food production and distribution and improving the effectiveness of their farming operations;

"'(2) To enter into contracts or other cooperative agreements with, or make grants to, land-grant colleges and universities and other institutions of higher learning in the United States to recruit persons who by reason of training, education, or practical experience are knowledgeable in the practical arts and sciences of agriculture and home economics, and to train such persons in the practical techniques of transmitting to farmers in such countries improved practices in agriculture, and to participate in carrying out the program in such countries including, where desirable, additional courses for training or retraining in such countries;

"'(3) To consult and cooperate with private non-profit farm organizations in the exchange of farm youth and farm leaders with developing countries and in the training of farmers of such developing countries within the United States or abroad;

"'(4) To conduct research in tropical and subtropical agriculture for the improvement and development of tropical and subtropical food products for dissemination and cultivation in friendly countries;

"'(5) To coordinate the program authorized in this section with the activities of the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and other agencies of the United States and to assign, upon agreement with such agencies, such persons to work with and under the administration of such agencies: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State;

"'(6) To establish by such rules and regulations as he deems necessary the conditions for eligibility and retention in and dismissal from the program established in this section, together with the terms, length and nature of service, compensation, employee status, oaths of office, and security clearances, and

such persons shall be entitled to the benefits and subject to the responsibilities applicable to persons serving in the Peace Corps pursuant to the provisions of section 612, volume 75, of the Statutes at Large, as amended; and

"'(7) To the maximum extent practicable, to pay the costs of such program through the use of foreign currencies accruing from the sale of agricultural commodities under this Act, as provided in section 104(i).

"'(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $33,000,000 during any fiscal year for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section.

"'SEC. 407. There is hereby established an advisory committee composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, the chairman, the vice chairman and the two ranking minority members of the House Committee on Agriculture and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the chairman, the next ranking majority member and the two ranking minority members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The advisory committee shall survey the general policies relating to the administration of the Act, including the manner of implementing the self-help provisions, the uses to be made of foreign currencies which accrue in connection with sales for foreign currencies under title I, the amount of currencies to be reserved in sales agreements for loans to private industry under section 104(e), rates of exchange, interest rates, and the terms under which dollar credit sales are made, and shall advise the President with respect thereto.

"'SEC. 408. The President shall make a report to Congress not later than April 1 each year with respect to the activities carried out under this Act during the preceding calendar year. Such report shall describe the progress of each country with which agreements are in effect under title I in carrying out its agreements under such title.

"'SEC. 409. No agreements to finance sales under title I and no programs of assistance under title II shall be entered into after December 31, 1968.

"'SEC. 410. The provisions of section 620(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (referring to nationalization, expropriation, and related governmental Acts affecting property owned by United States citizens), shall be applicable to assistance provided under title I of this Act.'

"SEC. 3. (a) Section 9 of the Act of September 6, 1958 (7 U.S.C. 1431b), is amended, effective January 1, 1967, by deleting the symbol '(1)', by changing the semicolon to a period and by striking out all of the language in the section after the semicolon.

"(b) Section 709 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (7 U.S.C. 1446a-1) is amended, effective January 1, 1967, by striking out 'foreign distribution,'.

"(c) Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1431), is amended, effective January 1, 1967, by striking out the following: 'and (4) to donate any such food commodities in excess of anticipated disposition under (1), (2), and (3) above to nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with the Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the Foreign Operations Administration or other appropriate department or agency of the Federal Government and intergovernmental organizations for use in the assistance of needy persons and in nonprofit school lunch programs outside the United States'; 'and (4) above'; ', in the case of commodities made available for use within the United States, or their delivery free alongside ship or free on board export carrier at point of export, in the case of commodities made available for use outside the United States'; and 'The assistance to needy persons provided in (4) above shall, insofar as practicable be directed toward community and other self-help designed to alleviate the causes of the need for such assistance.'

"(d) Section 8 of Public Law 85-931 (72 Stat. 1792) is amended (1) by inserting a period in lieu of the colon after the word 'Act' and striking out the proviso; (2) by inserting after the word 'manufactured' the word 'entirely'; and (3) by inserting before the comma following the words 'surplus supply' the words 'in the same manner as any other agricultural commodity or product is made available'.

"(e) Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking the period at the end of the third sentence thereof and adding the following: '*: Provided*, That whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the carryover at the end of any marketing year of a price supported agricultural commodity for which a voluntary adjustment program is in effect will be less than 25 per centum (35 per centum in the case of wheat) of the estimated export and domestic consumption of such commodity during such marketing year, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any of its stocks of such commodity during such year for unrestricted use at less than 115 per centum (120 per centum in the case of wheat whenever its carryover will be less than 25 per centum of such estimated export and domestic consumption) of the current price support loan plus reasonable carrying charges.'

"SEC. 4. Commercial sales of agricultural commodities out of private stocks on credit terms of not to exceed three years may be financed by CCC under its Export Credit Sales program. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the CCC annually for its actual costs incurred or to be incurred under its Export Credit Sales Program.

"SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect as of January 1, 1967, except that section 4 shall take effect upon enactment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
HARLAN HAGEN,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
MRS. CATHERINE MAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
B. EVERETT JORDAN,
GEORGE MCGOVERN,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
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 amendment of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 14929, to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in accompanying conference report.

The amendment of the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of H.R. 14929 and substituted a new bill which differed from the House bill in some 38 different provisions. Following are the substantive differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to by the conferees.

SHORT TITLE

The Senate amendment changed the short title of the bill to "Food for Peace Act of 1966" instead of "Food for Freedom" as in the House bill. The conferees have agreed to the amendment made by the Senate but point out that this short title applies to this act only. It does not change the title of the basic legislation which remains "The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954."

(All the changes in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, commonly called Public Law 480, are contained in section 2 of H.R. 14929. For easy reference, therefore, changes in the House bill discussed here will be identified by sections and subsections in the revised text of the basic law and the basic law will be referred to as Public Law 480.)

TRANSITION FROM SOFT CURRENCY SALES

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained a provision (sec. 103(b)) directing the President to take steps to insure a progressive transition from sales for foreign currency to sales for dollars at a rate whereby the transition could be completed by December 31, 1971. To this language the Senate added a sentence providing that, to the extent transition to dollars under the terms applicable to dollar sales (secs. 106 and 107) is not possible, transition may be made to sales for foreign currency on credit terms no less favorable to the United States than those for development loans made under section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and which would permit conversion to dollars at the exchange rate applicable to the sales agreement. This provides for convertible currency credit sales on terms similar to those in the House bill for dollar credit sales.

SALES TO COUNTRIES DEALING WITH CUBA OR NORTH VIETNAM

The House bill (sec. 103(d)) prohibited the making of sales agreements for foreign currencies or dollar credit under Public Law 480, with any nation which "sells or furnishes or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba or North Vietnam (excluding U.S. installations in Cuba) any equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as they are governed by a Communist regime."

To this provision the Senate added a proviso that the President might enter into a sales agreement with any such nation if he determined such sale to be in the national interest of the United States. It also provided that he might use funds appropriated to carry out Public Law 480 for the formulation and administration of such agreements, notwithstanding the requirements of any appropriation act.

The conferees agreed to drop the Senate amendment giving the President discretionary authority in this area and adopted the House language with an amendment striking out the words "equipment, materials, or commodities," and inserting in lieu thereof the materials covered by the Battle Act, which prohibits U.S. assistance to certain countries. This language reads as follows: "items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition and implements of war."

The conference substitute does not contain the Senate language which would have superseded a similar prohibition in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act for 1967.

PUBLICIZING FOREIGN CURRENCY COMMODITIES

The House bill (sec. 103(1)) required the President to obtain commitments from purchasing countries that, insofar as practicable, food commodities sold for foreign currencies

would be marked or identified at the point of distribution or sale as being provided on a concessional basis through the generosity of the people of the United States. The Senate amendment struck out this provision and required that the President obtain commitments from purchasing countries to publicize widely to their people by public media and other means, that the commodities are being provided on a concessional basis through the friendship of the American people as food for peace. The conferees have agreed to retain the language of both the House and Senate bills.

CURRENCY CONVERSION

The Senate amendment (Sec. 103(m)) added two provisions with respect to convertibility of foreign currencies received under Public Law 480. The first is that such currencies should be made available for payment of U.S. obligations or charges payable to the government of the importing country or any of its agencies. This is intended to cover payments such as canal tolls for vessels owned by the U.S. Government and similar charges. It is consistent with existing law and was accepted by the House conferees.

The second convertibility requirement was that such additional amount of the foreign currency paid for Public Law 480 commodities as might be necessary to cover all normal expenditures of American tourists in the importing country (up to 25 percent of the foreign currencies received pursuant to each agreement) should be convertible. The House conferees accepted this amendment, also, with an amendment limiting its application to excess currency countries. Since all of the currencies involved in the convertible currency sales authorized in section 103 (b) are fully convertible, this provision will not apply to such transactions.

DISPLACEMENT OF CASH SALES

The House conferees accepted a Senate amendment (sec. 103(n)) requiring the President to take maximum precautions to assure that sales for dollars on credit terms under this act shall not displace any sales of United States agricultural commodities which would otherwise be made for cash dollars. The House bill already contained a similar provision with respect to foreign currency sales and private dollar credit sales, which was retained by the conference.

RELEASE OF MARKET DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

The House bill (sec. 104(b)(1)) contained a provision (which is a restatement of present law) that the Secretary of Agriculture may release such amounts of foreign currencies set aside for market development purposes as he determines will not be needed within a reasonable period of time for such purpose. The Senate amendment would have permitted such a release only after notification by the President to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture of the proposed release and then only if neither committee adopted a resolution stating in substance that the committee did not favor such release. The committee of conference has accepted the Senate amendment as to that part requiring a report to be made to the two committees but eliminated that portion giving the committees the authority to veto the proposed release.

EMERGENCY RELIEF USES

The House bill authorized (sec. 104(d)) the use of foreign currencies to meet emergency or extraordinary relief requirements overseas. The Senate added an amendment limiting this authority to requirements for other than food commodities and limited the amount which might be used to $5 million in any fiscal year. This amendment was accepted by the conferees.

PLANNING FOOD AND NUTRITIONAL PROGRAMS

The conferees did not accept a Senate amendment authorizing the use of foreign currencies for financing planning of national food and nutrition programs because they believe that this proposal is adequately covered by section 104(h) of the House bill.

Approval of Grants. The Senate added an amendment to Section 104 subjecting certain foreign currency grants and uses of foreign currency loan repayments to Appropriation Act or committee approval. The amendment required that: (A) subject to Presidential waiver, Appropriation Act authorization is required for grants under sections 104 (f) and (g) and for use of 10 percent of the foreign currencies under agreements prior to December 31, 1964 and 20 percent under agreements thereafter; and (B) it also required that grants (other than military assistance) of any foreign currencies, or any use of loan repayments could be made only after notice to, and the absence of disapproval action by, each of the congressional agriculture committees. The conferees have accepted this Senate amendment with an amendment striking out the authority of the congressional agriculture committees to veto a proposed grant but requiring Presidential notification to such committees in advance with respect to each such proposed action.

INTEREST ON FOREIGN CURRENCY LOANS

The conferees accepted a modified Senate amendment requiring that interest rates on any loan made under the authority of section 104 of Public Law 480 should be not less than the cost of funds to the U.S. Treasury unless the President should designate a different rate after consultation with the Advisory Committee established under section 407 of the act.

EXCESS CURRENCY COUNTRIES

The conferees also accepted a Senate amendment which would exempt excess currency countries from the requirements described in the two preceding paragraphs. An excess currency country for the purposes of this section is one in which the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the foreign currency or credits owned by the United States and available for use in such nation are in excess of the normal requirements of the Departments and agencies of the United States for expenditures in such nation for the 2 fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such determination is made. The amendment provides that the amount of any such excess currency shall be devoted, to the extent practicable and without regard to the requirements of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, to the acquisition of sites, buildings, and grounds and to assist the purchasing nation in undertaking self-help measures to increase its production of agricultural commodities and its facilities for storage and distribution of such commodities. The President is required to advise the House and Senate Agricultural Committees of a determination by the Secretary of the Treasury that a country has become an excess currency country and to keep such committees advised as to the extent of such excess, the purposes for which it is used or proposed to be used, and the effects of such use.

TERMS OF DOLLAR CREDIT SALES

The House bill (sec. 106) permitted sales on long-term dollar credit on the same terms authorized for development loans under section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. This is presently a 40-year repayment period with a 10-year grace period during which no payments on the principal would have to be made, with interest at 1 percent during the grace period and 2½ percent thereafter. The Senate amendment reduced the payment period to 20 years and the grace period to 2 years and limited the delivery period of commodities under such an agreement to not more than 10 years. This is substantially the provision of the present law. In view of the provision in section 103(b) for foreign currency credit sales with the requirement that the currency be fully convertible to dollars, and with a maximum term similar to that in section 106 of the bill as passed by the House, the House conferees accepted the Senate amendment to section 106.

This amendment also requires that local currency proceeds of sales of commodities on long-term dollar credit be used in the recipient country for economic development purposes agreed upon between the two governments at the time the sale is made and written into the sales agreement.

LONG-TERM DOLLAR CREDIT SALES BY THE PRIVATE TRADE

Although the Senate amendment had substantially altered section 107, dealing with long-term dollar credit sales by the private trade, the conferees adopted substantially the House language on this section. The language adopted by the conference requires that the provisions of section 106 should apply to private trade dollar credit with respect also to the 10-year maximum delivery period and the 2-year deferral of the first payment. It also added to section 107(b) the requirement that the Secretary should take reasonable precautions to safeguard the usual marketings of the United States.

Section 107(d) stipulates the other sections of the act which are applicable to private trade agreements and to those listed in the House bill were added: Section 103(a) requiring the President to take self-help efforts into account; section 110 bringing private trade agreements within the total authorization of $1.9 billion in any year, plus carryover; section 401 providing for determination by the Secretary of Agriculture of commodities available for export and prohibiting dispositions which would result in a shortage; section 404 providing that assistance be directed toward humanitarian objectives and United States interests; and section 405 providing for assistance to countries helping themselves to meet their food needs and population growth problems. Those provisions of section 103(d) which relate only to foreign currency sales do not, of course, apply to this section.

In agreeing to the House language of section 107, with the amendments noted, the conferees make the following observations about this section:

First, the agricultural commodities which may be exported under the authority of this section include livestock, if the particular livestock to be exported meet the requirements set out in section 401 with respect to available agricultural commodities generally; second, the term "private economic enterprise" in section 107(a) is intended to include private housing developments.

CCC COMMERCIAL EXPORT CREDIT

Section 107 of the House bill also contained a provision permitting CCC export credit (now limited to CCC stocks) to be used also in the export of private stocks, and authorizing appropriations to CCC to reimburse it for credits extended under such program. The conferees have deleted this from section 107 of the revised language of Public Law 480 and have made it a separate section of the bill, appearing near the end as a new section 4.

OCEAN FREIGHT CHARGES

The conference adopted, with an amendment, the Senate language of section 108, dealing with payment of ocean freight charges. This provides that CCC may finance ocean freight charges for sales of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies only to the extent that such charges are higher than would otherwise be the case by reason of the requirement that commodities be transported on United States flag vessels.

The balance of such charges for transportation in United States vessels is to be paid in dollars by the recipient nation or organization. This limitation does not apply to sales for dollar credit under sections 106 or 107 or sales on foreign currency credit terms (requiring full convertibility to dollars) under section 103(b).

SELF-HELP FOR AGRICULTURE

The conferees adopted a Senate amendment making it clear that the proviso in section 109, relating to self-help for agriculture in recipient countries, is to be a positive requirement that 20 percent of certain currencies be set aside for the self-help purposes described in section 109, rather than a standard suggested for the President's consideration.

STIPULATION OF SELF-HELP PROGRAM IN AGREEMENTS

The conferees also accepted a Senate amendment to section 109 which provides that each agreement entered into shall describe the programs which the recipient country is undertaking to improve its production, storage, and distribution of agricultural commodities and for termination of such agreement whenever the President finds that such a program is not being adequately developed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR TITLE I

The House bill provided an annual authorization of not to exceed $2.5 billion, plus carryover, for title I. The Senate reduced this authorization to $1.9 billion, plus carryover, and the conferees have agreed to the Senate figure.

ASSISTANCE TO NEEDY PERSONS

The conferees accepted a Senate amendment making it clear that assistance to needy persons authorized in section 201 is limited to agricultural commodity assistance. This is consistent with the intention of the House language.

AUTHORIZATION FOR TITLE II

The House bill authorized programs of assistance (donations) under title II of not to exceed $800 million per year, plus carryover. The Senate reduced this figure to $600 million per year, plus carryover, and the committee of conference has accepted the Senate figure.

ASSISTANCE OF OTHER COUNTRIES

The committee of conference accepted a Senate provision stating that it is the sense of Congress that the President should encourage other advanced nations to make increased contributions for the purpose of combatting world hunger and malnutrition, particularly through the expansion of international food and agricultural assistance programs. The section also states that it is further the sense of Congress that as a means of achieving this objective, the United States should work for expansion of the United Nations world food program beyond its present established goals.

GUIDELINES AS TO "AVAILABILITY"

The conference agreed to a Senate amendment to section 401 establishing guidelines as to the availability of commodities for export under Public Law 480 and providing that no commodity shall be available for such distribution if it should reduce the domestic supply of such commodity below the quantity needed to meet domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars. The conferees did not agree to a Senate amendment to section 401 which would have placed in the Secretary of Agriculture (instead of the President) the authority to determine the countries with which sales agreements would be made.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY

The conference agreed to a Senate amendment making it clear that the term "agricultural commodity" as used in this act means only agricultural commodities produced in the United States. This is merely a clarification of the intent of the House.

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AND TOBACCO

The conference also agreed to a Senate amendment prohibiting the sale or donation of alcoholic beverages under this act and the donation of tobacco or tobacco products. This is a restatement of the existing policies under which Public Law 480 is operated. No alcoholic beverages have ever been exported either by sale or through a donation program and tobacco has never been included in any donation program. In accepting this amendment the conferees intend that the Department of Agriculture shall continue its efforts to export tobacco as part of the sales programs authorized under title I of this act.

BUDGET PRESENTATION

The conference agreed to a Senate amendment to section 403 requiring that the President, in presenting his budget, shall classify expenditures under this act as expenditures for international affairs and finance, rather than for agriculture and agricultural resources.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The conferees agreed to a Senate amendment to section 407, establishing a joint legislative-executive advisory committee on Public Law 480, which would add to the membership of the committee the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the two ranking majority and minority members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

ANNUAL REPORT

The conferees agreed to a Senate amendment requiring the President's annual report to be made not later than April 1, and to describe the progress of each country's self-help program.

COTTON PRODUCTS

The House bill contained an amendment to section 8 of the Public Law 89-931 (not a part of Public Law 480) providing that cotton products could be exported under Public Law 480, if cotton constituted a "substantial portion" of the sales price. The conference committee has agreed to the Senate wording of this provision, with an amendment, providing that cotton products may be financed under Public Law 480 "in the same manner as any other agricultural commodity or product is made available" if the product to be financed is manufactured "entirely" of cotton. This would permit cotton product exports to be financed under the same circumstances as the products of other agricultural commodities.

ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS

The House bill contained a provision requiring the Secretary of Agriculture, in planning voluntary production adjustment programs, to plan for a carryover at the end of the marketing year of not less than 25 percent of the total estimated requirements of such marketing year. The conferees agreed to strike this provision of the House bill.

CCC RESALE PRICE

The House bill contained a provision (not a part of Public Law 480) that whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the carryover at the end of any marketing year, of a price supported agricultural commodity for which a voluntary adjustment program is in effect, will be less than 25 percent of the estimated export and domestic consumption of such commodity, the CCC would be prohibited from selling any of its stocks of such commodity during such year for unrestricted use at less than 115 percent of the current support loan plus reasonable carrying charges (instead of 105 percent of the support loan plus carrying charges, as provided in existing law). The Senate amendment changed the 115 percent resale price to 120 percent and put in a special provision with respect to wheat that the higher resale price should become effective if the carryover dropped below 35 percent (instead of 25 percent as for other commodities). The conferees agreed to the House language with respect to commodities other than wheat and for wheat agreed that the 115 percent resale minimum should become effective if the carryover dropped below 35 percent and that the CCC resale minimum should be 120 percent if the supply dropped below 25 percent.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
HARLAN HAGEN,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
CATHERINE MAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. COOLEY (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with. I think everyone is familiar with the statement.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief statement.

First I want to say that this is a very, very important bill, which came out of the Committee on Agriculture by a vote of 33 to 2 and passed the House by a vote of 333 to only 20. Our bill was called the Food for Freedom Act of 1966. The Senate bill was called the Food for Peace Act of 1966. We went to conference and we made a diligent effort to retain the House provisions. We had a long discussion, much of it about the name of the bill, which, of course, all of us know stems from Public Law 480, which has operated for 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, under Public Law 480, we have shared our great abundance with less fortunate people in other parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of millions of people in more than 100 nations of this earth have been permitted to share in this great abundance which we have harvested from our own flourishing fields.

Mr. Speaker, I have maintained for many years that bread and butter will be more effective in the cause of peace than bullets, bayonets, and bombs.

Mr. Speaker, this program that we have here under consideration, is a program which more or less embraces that theory, because we are now about to embark upon an entirely different program from the programs which we have exercised in the past.

Mr. Speaker, under the programs of the past we have taken away from production more than 50 million acres of fertile farmland. And, we did that at a time when we were living in a hungry world. We did it at a time when 12,000

human beings were dying daily of starvation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my recollection that I stated at the time the bill was pending before the House earlier that I have never seen a finer array of witnesses in any committee room of this Congress than those who came to talk to us about the problem of the world population explosion, and the world food crisis which we are told is now approaching us.

Mr. Speaker, we had witnesses from the great universities, witnesses from the Ford Foundation, and witnesses from the Rockefeller Foundation, and witnesses from throughout our entire Nation. I do not recall, Mr. Speaker, that a single witness appeared in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the only controversy that now remains is the controversy dealing with the involvement with North Vietnam and Cuba. Mr. Speaker, we had very strict language in the House bill which provided that no latitude was given for shipment of any articles to those areas.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that everyone in this House knew at the time what we were doing. However, when we got into conference, the other body insisted upon other provisions, and we were in a situation where we had to compose some differences. We did compose the differences. And, actually, we wrote into the conference report the Battle Act—the Trading with the Enemy Act. But, that applies to only certain munitions of war and other items which are mentioned therein.

Mr. Speaker, the House provisions were to this effect:

> For the purpose only of sales of agricultural commodities under title I of this act any nation which sells or furnishes or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba or North Vietnam, excluding U.S. installations in Cuba any equipment, materials or commodities, so long as they are governed by a Communist regime—

Mr. Speaker, that was the language contained in our bill.

And, then we inserted the Battle Act, which act reads as follows:

> Items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition and implements of war.

That is the language of the Battle Act. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the House working its will on this proposal. In view of the fact that I feel that way about it, I would like to ask unanimous consent that conference report be returned to the conference in an effort to further insist upon the House language being incorporated in the final draft of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I feel that the conference report should be returned to the conference committee to deal with this enemy-trading question but not by means of unanimous consent.

I shall object to the motion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture because I feel that we might easily get into a last-minute parliamentary situation in which some further loose language similar to that presently in the conference committee report might be accepted under the pressure of adjournment. The present language would permit nations to trade with North Vietnam or Cuba in nonstrategic goods and still have the advantage of the concessional sales provision, under which our taxpayers finance long-term credit at low interest. If House conferees return without instructions, similar language might be placed before the House in the last-minute rush of adjournment on what amounts to a take-it-or-leave-it basis. I can easily imagine such circumstances developing in the next 10 days or so, and therefore I feel that now is the time for the House to deal with this, and I think it would be far better for us to return the committee report to the committee by way of insisting on the House position.

A motion to that effect will be presented today by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Therefore, for that reason I do object to the motion.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that an objection has been made, and I am certain that the gentleman does not make that motion because of lack of confidence in the conference committee, I will yield half of the remaining time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I was privileged to have been on the Committee on Agriculture when it worked those many long months to bring this legislation out of committee, and to the House.

I also felt privileged to serve as one of the conferees for the Food for Peace Act of 1966.

I do agree with our distinguished chairman that, with one exception, certainly the House and the Senate conferees worked to the improvement of this bill. I feel it is a meaningful piece of legislation, and one that poses a real challenge, to American agriculture in its design to bring increased agricultural commodities into the hands of our friendly needy throughout the world.

I would like to make just three very brief points here today: One. This challenge and the new demands it is going to pose to the American producers of food, certainly points up the need for governmental farm policies that will encourage, not discourage, the farmer. Our American farmer is going to have extra demands placed upon him to provide the people of this Nation a stable supply of foods at as reasonable prices under present inflationary circumstances at the same time he must produce food for the hungry of other nations. I hope that the USDA is going to review its present farm program policies with this in mind.

I think the farmer of America has to be given constant assurance that the Government is a friend and not a competitor.

In this connection, I would like to point out that on page 21 of the conference report, for those of us who have been interested in resale prices of food in Government stocks, that the House and the Senate conferees did come up with what I think was good protective language concerning the resale of commodities, including wheat, at certain levels.

This so that we could protect farmers from being in competition with the Government and protecting them from having Government stocks dumped upon the market.

The other point I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues is that the other minority conferee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I did sign the conference report. We felt that the bill that was agreed on, except in one area, was good.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] did not sign it—but not because he did not agree with many of the good things in this legislation, but so that he could be free to bring before this House the question that we all know is facing us, and to offer the language that would restore the very good wording that this House adopted by an overwhelming vote—protective language that would keep us from supplying or making concessional sales, and very favorable sales, to the countries that are trading with North Vietnam where our boys are being killed, and with Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma for bringing this before the House today so that we can act upon it, make a clear-cut record, and let the other body know that we insist the language of the House bill must stay in the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. We should emphasize the fact mentioned by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], in his letter to all the Members of the House. He pointed out that the House-approved language, both in the appropriations act and the House version of the food-for-peace bill applies only to concessional sales. It does not apply to donations. It does not apply to cash sales. The motion to be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma will strengthen the position of the House in any further conference on this bill.

I would also like to add that it was my understanding that we were expanding the food-for-peace program and therefore I was surprised and shocked to read a report in the New York Times of August 2 that the Secretary of Agriculture had notified all of our Embassies around the world that wheat shipments under

the Food for Peace Act would be reduced by about 25 percent.

Of course, the conclusion of that, and I think the damaging fact is that the wheat market has dropped about 35 cents a bushel in the Midwest in the past 15 days. This, of course, has had a very damaging effect upon the economy of all the wheat producers in America. Rumors are circulating and it appears there may be a cutback under the food-for-peace program by the Secretary of Agriculture.

This is good legislation with one or two exceptions. If we vote for the motion, we will in effect strengthen the position of the House in conference.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] for her excellent statement and to associate myself with her remarks.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentlewoman if any distinction was made in conferences between trade with Cuba and trade with North Vietnam?

It would seem the conference committee might take a different attitude with respect to the developing countries, for example, trading with Cuba and their trading with North Vietnam. We are at war in Vietnam, and are understandably concerned at those who continue to trade with North Vietnam.

I would hope, on the other hand, that perhaps we would reconsider the advisability of a flat prohibition against aid to a country like India, which is admittedly making sales of jute to Cuba. Was any distinction made between trade with the two countries?

Mrs. MAY. In reply to the gentleman, I will say that this was discussed in our conference committee. It was also discussed in Agriculture Committee. I think the point was made that the conference report itself makes no distinction between Cuba and North Vietnam. The fact is we provide India with many, many millions of dollars worth of food under various titles of Public Law 480 and in return we thought that maybe they could give up their very small jute trade, estimated to be only $600,000 per year.

I would add that in further support of the food-for-peace program, my State of Washington is ideally equipped to help America meet this challenge because it is a State that ranks high in the production of a wide variety of farm commodities. As per relatively recent figures, these farm products were valued at $619,207,000 on an annual base, with two-thirds of this sum coming from crops and one-third from livestock. Washington ranks fifth in the Nation as a producer of wheat, first in the production of apples, hops, late summer potatoes, and dry field peas, second in Bartlett pears, apricots, alfalfa seed; and third in asparagus and strawberries. Cherries, cranberries, and grapes also are important agricultural commodities.

The Fourth Congressional District of Washington, which I have the honor of representing in the Congress, plays a prominent part in the State's agricultural production, for this is preponderantly an agricultural district. Yakima County, for instance, leads all the counties of the United States in apple production, with Whitman and Adams counties in the Palouse region of southeast Washington ranking first and third nationally in the per-county production of wheat.

The challenge posed by the new food-for-peace program becomes particularly significant when it is realized that an increasing number of agricultural acres are being diverted into community and industrial development and other non-agricultural uses, thereby continuously contracting the base of our agricultural potential.

The Fourth District which I represent in the Congress is particularly well equipped to fill this gap on agricultural acres, for land increasingly is coming into production through irrigation in the Columbia River Basin. Furthermore, maximum production is still to be reached on 1 million acres in the Grand Coulee irrigation project.

In summary, then, both my State and my congressional district will play something far more than a token part in the food-for-peace program, as newly designed. We have played an important part in the past, and we look forward with great anticipation to the part we will play in the future.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have two purposes in asking for this time. First, I hopefully wish to make legislative history on a point in the conference report which is left a little bit unclear.

Title I actually provides two types of soft currency sales: one of the conventional sort, which is repayable almost exclusively in foreign currency; this is the type we have had for several years; and the other type authorizes loan of soft currencies, loans which would be repayable over as long as 40 years in dollars.

This is a very attractive arrangement to the countries taking part, because it permits interest as low as three-fourths of 1 percent; that is, less than 1 percent for 10 years, and only 2½ percent for an additional 30 years.

I would like to ask the chairman, or anyone else who would respond, if my understanding is correct that the intention of this legislation is that no Communist country, whether it be Yugoslavia, Poland, or otherwise, would be eligible for either type of soft-currency transaction, so long as it is under a Communist government. Am I correct in that interpretation?

Mr. COOLEY. It is under section 103(d).

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct; subsection (2).

Mr. COOLEY. This applies to concessional sales.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am sure the intention of the committee is to deny to Communist countries the advantage of soft-currency sales of either type.

Mr. COOLEY. The present law prohibits local currency sales to countries described in section 103(d)(2) but permits dollar credit sales. This language is a restatement of present law. So I assume local currency sales are prohibited.

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes; but there are two types of soft-currency sales. One is repayable ultimately in dollars, but starts out as a soft-currency transaction. I just wanted to clarify the intent of the committee, which I believe is to deny to any Communist country access to either type of soft-currency transaction.

Mr. COOLEY. If it is payable in dollars, of course, it is hard currency.

Mr. FINDLEY. But it comes under title I, which is the soft-currency part of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. If it is a foreign-currency sale, it could not be a dollar sale.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is my understanding correct: Whether it is the conventional type of soft-currency transaction or the other type, part of which might be repayable in dollars, Communist countries would not have access to this type of contract?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know whether I understand the gentleman correctly or not, but it does apply to any kind of concessional sales to countries that are trading with the enemy, so to speak, selling anything of significance to North Vietnam or to Cuba.

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes; the trading-with-the-enemy ban placed a ban on dollar sales. What I was trying to clarify was the distinction that applied to soft-currency transactions only. I believe if I understand the gentleman correctly, the intent of the committee is to deny to any Communist country access to this kind of transaction.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct. The provision the gentleman refers to was added by the Senate and accepted by the conferees. I do not think it was our intention thereby to give those countries described in section 103(d)(2) any softer terms than in existing law so I would assume, therefore, that the prohibition would apply to any kind of foreign currency sale, whether for cash or credit.

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

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. May I call the attention of this body to pages 25053 and 25054 of Tuesday's RECORD. It contains information for your reference to indicate the extent of trading with North Vietnam that does exist between Yugoslavia, Poland, and Egypt. Each of these countries in the past has had tremendous benefits under the Public Law 480 program, and each is either presently getting the advantage or seeking to establish this advantage. That is why I feel

a firm, hard position on the trading-with-the-enemy provision is very much needed.

There is some concern on the part of the State Department about Cuba.

The gentleman from New Jersey alluded to this. But I point out to you that Cuba was the official host to the Communist Three-Continent Conference in January 1966, just earlier this year, and at that conference full support of the Vietcong in North Vietnam was approved and organized.

With the U.S. death toll in Vietnam now about 5,000 and steadily rising, it is difficult for me to understand why anyone would hesitate to use every available legislative means to shut down shipping of all kinds to both Cuba and North Vietnam.

Pertinent information was contained in the following Allen-Scott syndicated newspaper column of October 3, 1966:

HOODWINKING UNCLE SAM

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

While Congress, under White House spurring, is in the process of enacting a two-year $5 billion continuance of Food-for-Peace, leading beneficiary countries are making a sucker of this humanitarian program.

Not only are they deliberately flouting specific U.S. laws to which they agreed in writing, but they are doing so to aid Communist nations.

Latest of these violators is Brazil in giving a helping hand to dictator Fidel Castro—whose gross mismanagement, waste and incompetence has resulted in severe food shortages and stringent rationing in once self-sufficient Cuba.

In 1965 and this year Brazil has received more than $61 million in U.S. grain and other food. An emergency gift of $2 million of corn was rushed there to avert famine among starving Indians and peasants.

At the very same time the U.S. was donating this desperately-needed succor, Brazil was selling 8,000 tons of corn to Communist-ruled Cuba.

Another extraordinary aspect of this deal is that it was arranged by Russia, which provided a freighter to transport the grain. Brazil is one of the biggest Latin American beneficiaries of U.S. economic and military aid—totaling more than $3 billion. Since 1955 it has also received $666.5 million in food supplies.

The State Department was fully aware of this bald violation of the Food-for-Peace act.

But as in other instances it said and did nothing.

"I have been unable to obtain any explanation from the State Department on these matters," says Senator ERNEST GRUENING, D-Alaska, head of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, who has been digging into them. "Similarly, I have been unable to obtain any explanation from the Agriculture and Treasury Departments or the Agency for International Development, all of whom are engaged in 'passing the buck' to one another.

"Congress will shortly enact a new Food-for-Peace act. The disclosure about Brazil emphatically confirms the necessity for additional congressional controls over this multi-billion dollar program if it is to become something more than a means by which countries receiving food assistance from us are enabled to increase their own exports to nations unfriendly to us."

Not only are the State Department and other agencies refusing to explain the Administration's failure to crack down on such violations, but every effort is being exerted to prevent their disclosure.

Joseph Lippman, staff director of the Senate subcommittee, knows that other Food-for-Peace beneficiaries have perpetrated even worse outrages. But his attempts to get at the details are constantly thwarted by various bureaucratic stratagems and obstructions.

Foremost among them is invoking secrecy; declaring documents and other material sought by Lippman as "classified."

After laborious ferreting, Lippman definitely established that Egypt and Greece, which have received hundreds of millions of dollars of U.S. food, have sold large quantities of such commodities to Communist countries specifically banned by the Food-for-Peace act.

As uncovered by Lippman, Egypt has received $903.6 million in U.S. grain, fats and oils, dairy and other products. In 1964 Nasser sold and bartered 313,945 tons of rice and other agricultural commodities to Cuba, one of the largest recipients; Red China, also high on the list; Russia, which got the most; East Germany; Bulgaria; Hungary, and Rumania.

U.S. food shipments to Greece, as determined by Lippman, total $245.8 million. In addition, the U.S. has given Greece $3.8 billion in economic and military aid. In 1965 and this year Greece has sold for cash 310,000 tons of wheat to two Communist countries—160,000 tons to North Korea; 150,000 tons to Bulgaria.

Senator GRUENING charges flatly that the State Department and other departments knew about these violations but blandly disregarded them.

"In November 1964," he says, "a two-year agreement was entered into between the U.S. and Greece whereby feed grains and wheat were to be furnished to Greece under Title IV of Public Law 480. A penalty clause was included providing that if at any time during the contract period, Greece exported any feed grains and wheat or flour, it would make payment to the U.S. for the value of such exports with interest at 6 per cent. This penalty clause has never been enforced.

"Similarly, despite a written agreement not to do so, the United Arab Republic increased its exports of rice to Communist countries at a time when it was receiving wheat from the U.S. which it used for domestic consumption instead of the rice normally consumed. The Department of State knew about these violations of the law and written agreements, but did absolutely nothing about them."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and those who have helped him on the splendid program which has been provided for by the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives in this bill. I believe it is a real step forward. It will be of tremendous value to the entire free world as well as to the people of America.

As pointed out by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, when the committee had before it this bill it was very careful in trying to limit trading with our enemies. It provided, among other things, that any nation which sells or furnishes or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba or North Vietnam any equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as they are governed by a Communist regime could not participate.

I supported that. So did the vast and overwhelming majority of the Members here.

The bill went to the other body. It was amended and then sent to conference.

In the conference, upon the insistence, as I understand it, of Members of the other body, the House conferees reluctantly went along with an amendment. They dropped the Senate amendment, giving the President discretionary authority in this area, and adopted the House language with an amendment striking out the words "equipment, materials, or commodities" and inserted in lieu thereof the language of the old Battle Act, as pointed out by the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

That is a weak, watered-down attempt to stop so-called friendly nations from trading with the enemy.

In my opinion, the American people are fed up with coddling our enemies and "playing footsies" with those who are assisting them.

We refer to them as "friendly nations." I wonder how friendly these nations are, if they are trading with the enemy in Vietnam, where our boys are being shot down and prisoners are being treated in the most horrible manner imaginable.

I read a news article last night in one of the papers printed here in Washington which said it had been charged that Brazil, "receiving $2 million worth of corn free from the United States, supposedly to feed its own hungry people, was shipping 8,000 tons of corn on a Russian freighter to Cuba."

I wonder how we are going to live with that. We have people over across the water being shot down and killed. Yet these so-called friendly nations—and I doubt their friendliness, if this is what they are doing—are demanding our help and at the same time are trading with our enemy and thereby building up the enemies' war power.

I believe it is time to take a firm stand. We should no longer coddle our enemies. We should no longer permit our so-called friends to do that. If they do that, they are not friendly.

I say we must strike out all trade in any manner with nations which continue to aid and assist in the building up of the military might of those who are leading the fight against us.

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

Mr. ABBITT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

I should merely like to ask whether the conferees might not have arrived at a flat prohibition against any aid to North Vietnam—I do not believe many would argue against that—but they might have allowed discretionary authority with regard to the continuation of trade with Cuba, with whom we are not at war. Cuba is a nuisance and even a threat, but if we have a flat prohibition the developing countries would be penalized if they should continue such trade with Cuba. On the other hand the developed countries which are our allies, such as Canada, the United Kingdom and France, which supply the major part of

the free world trade, would not be penalized.

Would it be possible to reach an agreement to have a flat prohibition with respect to North Vietnam, and discretionary authority for the President with respect to Cuba?

Mr. ABBITT. Of course, I cannot speak for the conferees, but personally I am wholeheartedly in favor of the motion that I understand our colleague from Oklahoma will offer, which is to recommit this conference report and to instruct our conferees to stand by the exact language of the bill as reported out of the Committee on Agriculture and approved by this House. I may be misquoting him, but that is my understanding of his position, and I heartily concur in that position. I urge the House to approve the motion to recommit this conference report and instruct our conferees to stand firmly by the language put in this bill by our Committee on Agriculture and thereby let the world know we realize we are in a war and will not permit our friends who receive our assistance to then turn around and support our enemies.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I think we all realize now that we are in an all-out war in Vietnam. Our boys are dying there daily. The enemy is one of the most ruthless that has ever been faced by our Armed Forces. Their horrible treatment of the prisoners is shocking to a point almost unbelievable. The wildest savages have never treated their prisoners worse.

It has now come to our attention that certain countries that have received aid and assistance from America are presently sending supplies to North Vietnam. These supplies are vital to the North Vietnam war effort. They are being used to kill and cripple Americans. It is prolonging the war effort of the North Vietnam regime of Ho Chi Minh. In addition, many of these same nations that are receiving aid and assistance from America supplied by the taxpayers' money are aiding and assisting the Castro regime in Cuba, the most diabolic regime in the Western Hemisphere.

When the Agriculture Committee of the House had before it the food-for-freedom legislation some time ago, it inserted in the bill a provision prohibiting the making of sales agreements for foreign currencies or dollar credit under Public Law 480 with any nation which sells, furnishes, or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba or North Vietnam any equipment, materials, or commodities so long as they are governed by Communist regimes. I strongly supported this particular provision. In my opinion, it is the least we can do to try to protect the boys that are fighting, dying, in Vietnam as well as to protect our entire Nation and way of life. The same applies to the Castro regime in Cuba. We must not ourselves nor permit any of our friends that we are helping do anything that will build up that regime which will later and is today trying to do everything in its power against the American way of life and our Nation.

We must realize that it is time to call a halt to aiding and assisting our enemies or permitting nations that are receiving help from us to assist our enemies. I, therefore, am very much opposed to the compromise worked out in conference between the Senate and the House which will permit, under certain circumstances, friendly nations to carry certain supplies to North Vietnam and to Cuba. I wholeheartedly support the effort to reject such compromise and to send this bill back to conference and to demand that the Senate agree to the House provision. The provision adopted by the conferees is riddled with loopholes and applies only to strategic materials such as arms, ammunition, atomic materials, and similar items. I must say that there are a lot of materials besides military goods which can be and are helpful to an enemy. If we are going to keep our boys in Vietnam we must call a halt to any way of helping the enemy or in any way permitting nations that we are assisting to help the enemy maintain its hostilities, to build up its armed forces, or in any way continue to wage a war which has been so devastating to our fighting forces.

I hasten to say that the language in the House bill as reported out by the Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, is limited to concessional sales under Public Law 480 and does not in any way affect food donations to hungry people anywhere in the world and I urge our Members to stand with us and insist upon the strong House-passed language rather than the weak-kneed provisions in the conference substitute. Unless this is done, medical supplies will continue to flow into North Vietnam and also into the Castro regime in Cuba.

Now is the time to stop the commerce with Ho and Castro by the nations that we are assisting financially. Assistance to friendly nations is a two-way street. If we are to continue helping them then they must reciprocate by refusing to trade in any way with our very enemy that is shooting down our boys and treating them worse than savages when they are captured and forgoing all humanitarian concepts as to the treatment of prisoners of war. It may be that we cannot prevent friendly nations from trading with North Vietnam and Cuba but certainly we do not have to assist them financially in building up their trading potentials with our hard-earned taxpayers' money to the great detriment of our war effort.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to say that I resent the attacks that have been made on the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], in connection with his position on this. He has a sincere position. However, I disagree with his position and I support this conference report the way it is. There was a rider attached to an appropriation bill relating purely to prohibiting aid to countries having commerce with North Vietnam, which was signed into law and which is in effect. I supported this restriction because we are engaged in a bloody war there. Our bill, as we sent it over to the Senate, flatly prohibited aid under this program to any country which dealt either with Cuba or North Vietnam. The other body changed that by qualifying the prohibition to give the President discretion to permit aid in his judgment to any country where they are dealing with either Vietnam or Cuba. At the same time it repealed the appropriation rider. We took a middle position in this conference report. We eliminated the Presidential discretion proviso with respect to sale and transport of goods of military value as defined by the Battle Act but left an implicit discretion with the President with respect to nonstrategic items.

There is a flat prohibition on aid to any country which deals with Cuba and North Vietnam in items of military value using the established definitions of the Battle Act. If a country, such as India, is trading with Cuba only with respect to some non-Battle Act or nonstrategic materials and it has been demonstrated that they do sell, for example, some hemp to Cuba for bagging, then there is no flat prohibition in the law on that. I am sure that the President in the exercise of his judgment could himself impose a prohibition in that instance. So there are plenty of safeguards here. I think this is a reasonable position. North Vietnam is completely beyond the pale in terms of this conference report with respect to trading in any type of commodity because there has been no showing that such trade has been conducted by countries which would receive aid under this bill. Cuba is flatly outside the scope except to the extent that trade only involves nonstrategic items such as hemp, which goes into making bags.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a reasonable compromise and should be adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. In other words, there is complete discretion with the President and he would have to OK any trade in any commodity with Cuba the way the conference report is written?

Mr. HAGEN of California. No. Actually we limit his discretion. He would have discretion only with respect to trade with Cuba in nonstrategic and non-Battle Act items. So we do limit his discretion. I submit that I am as anti-Vietnamese and as anti-Communist as anyone here. I also submit that a vote to support this conference report is not a pro-Communist vote. It is not a pro-Vietnamese vote nor pro-Cuban vote, either. It is a reasonable effort to conduct a program which has been of great value in our foreign policy. I wish to assert again that I supported the Findley rider to the appropriation bill and feel that it is wise.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. I agree with the gentleman. I just wanted to make sure that we will make it very clear as to what discretion the President has and the fact that no trade can be conducted in any commodity unless the President gives his OK.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, well, in the case of North Vietnam, almost certainly no trade whatsoever, in the case of Cuba, only these nonstrategic items. I wish to reiterate that it is foolhardy to tie the President's hands in our relationship to a country so important as India over an item of trade which has only marginal significance on the issue of whether or not we will ultimately defeat communism in Cuba. If we can trust the President to conduct our military operations in Vietnam and elsewhere we should most certainly trust him on this issue in this area of the world. We cannot afford the possibility of causing the fall of a friendly government in India over the issue of the sale of a few $100,000 worth of jute to Cuba if the President decides that such is the issue.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I am the author of the original amendment, or the sponsor in the House Committee on Agriculture, which was subsequently somewhat changed and modified in committee but in principle, retained, I, of course, support the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] and shall vote for his motion to recommit the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I trust that in discussing the specific issue before the House, with reference to preventing concessional sales to nations which trade with North Vietnam or Cuba, that we will not lose sight of the great impact Public Law 480 has had on free world countries since its enactment in 1954. Earlier this year, H.R. 14929 was passed by the House by a vote of 333 to 20, which is indicative of the strong support the program has in the Congress. Public Law 480, as amended and extended by H.R. 14929, offers new hope to free world countries as well as the American farmer.

Yesterday I inserted in the RECORD some specifics about a new concept in the food-for-peace program, the farmer-to-farmer program. The primary purpose of the farmer-to-farmer program is to strengthen the agricultural economies of friendly countries in order to meet rising world food needs. In my opinion, if this section is properly administered, it can become an effective weapon in transferring American know-how and show-how around the world. Certainly it is my hope that the U.S. Department of Agriculture will administer the program through and with the coordination of the Federal Extension Service and the land-grant colleges throughout America. This program emphasizes the principle of self-help. It can be of great significance if the recipient countries express a willingness to help themselves.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, we spent about 3 or 4 days in this conference with the other body, and it is my opinion that a very good job was done, as a whole, in working out the disagreements between the House of Representatives and the other body.

Mr. Speaker, there is one particular part of this conference report to which I object, and that is the elimination of the provision contained in the House bill which prohibits the sale of any commodities, supplies, or anything else whatsoever to either North Vietnam or to Cuba, by any nation receiving concessional sales.

Mr. Speaker, on this point a compromise was reached, whereby the Battle Act was substituted for the prohibition of the House language.

Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I shall offer a motion to recommit, a motion which will insist upon the House language.

Mr. Speaker, I have served almost 16 years in the House of Representatives. It is very seldom that I take the floor, except upon some issue on which I have very deep convictions.

Mr. Speaker, I have never been accused of taking the floor to discuss a partisan angle or to demagog. However, Mr. Speaker, a member of the President's Cabinet accused me, in a letter which he circulated to certain Members up here on the Hill, in which he said I was certainly demagoging upon an emotional issue.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that emotional issue is a gross understatement. It really is an emotional issue, and if the Members of the House do not think so, just go back home and talk to the mothers and fathers of the boys now in Vietnam, and you will find that it is a very, very emotional issue.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, he not only believes me to be a demagog, but he has called 333 of you fellows a demagog right along with me, because 333 of you voted for this identical language, and only 20 Members of the House voted against the move which would include this language.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will recall that in last April, when the gentleman from Illinois offered an amendment, an amendment similar in import to this one, to the appropriation bill pending at that time, there was a roll-call vote in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, that vote occurred at a time when very few Members were on the floor of the House, and a great number of the Members just walked in here and voted against this vote on this particular amendment, and, then, 17 of you, very embarrassingly and very sheepishly, had to sneak down here to the well of the House and change your vote.

Members of the House, today you are not going to have to do that. I have alerted you to this issue, and you can cast your final vote the first time, and it will not be necessary for you to change your vote.

It is very easy for the Secretary of Agriculture to ask you gentlemen to come down here and vote against this motion to recommit. The Secretary of Agriculture is not going to get shot at by anybody in Vietnam, and he is not even going to get shot at by any of your constituents back home in the coming campaign. He is completely safe down there behind that mahogany desk.

Treason is defined as aiding and giving comfort to the enemy. Well, aid and comfort include a lot of things that are not described by the Battle Act.

By the way, I was not entirely able to hear the gentleman from California, but I think there might have been a mistake made in what he interpreted this conference report to include. This conference report does not include any discretion on the part of the President. It includes only the Battle Act. It applies both to Vietnam and Cuba in the same respect.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAGEN of California. As I understand it, the conference report relates only to Cuba, and this rider that was on the appropriation bill governs with respect to Vietnam.

Mr. BELCHER. The conference report applies to both Cuba and Vietnam in exactly the same respect. You can ship anything to Vietnam that you can ship to Cuba. And that means anything.

Mr. HAGEN of California. No; I disagree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I suggest to the gentleman from California that he confer with the counsel right there at the desk. He will tell the gentleman that it applies to both countries in exactly the same way.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I understand, Mr. BELCHER, that you are correct. However, this rider which is on the appropriations bill in effect only covers trading with North Vietnam.

Mr. BELCHER. That does not cover anything under this bill.

Mr. HAGEN of California. It does.

Mr. BELCHER. In this bill we are determining what can be shipped to Vietnam, and what can be shipped to Cuba.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Actually, I was slightly in error, but we added some language to the Battle Act, language of primary strategic value.

Mr. BELCHER. No, we did not. The Battle Act is in this conference report just exactly as it has always been. It is the same identical Battle Act which has been passed on time and time again which permits shipping almost anything except the atomic bomb.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Yes. I hate to be in error, but you are quite right.

But the Battle Act covers any and all strategic items, in effect, although there is no provision for Presidential discretion. But you know and I know that he always has that discretion, and if he wants to oversee these shipments he can go ahead and do it.

So, conferring discretion on him is kind of an idle act which the Senate did.

Mr. BELCHER. Are there any other things which the gentleman from California would confess he has been in error about?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I am not going to mislead anyone, Mr. BELCHER.

Mr. BELCHER. I understand that.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I appreciate your sincerity, but I think we are tying the hands of the President. Again, what is involved here, basically, are some jute sales by India. Actually, India is the primary beneficiary in this bill. It is a very important population area. It is the key to Asia. And if we are going to create problems that the President thinks we might create by this body today, I think we should avoid that possibility.

Mr. BELCHER. Let me tell you just about India. India is going to get under this bill approximately $1 billion worth. They have sold in 9 months $600,000 worth of jute to Cuba. If they are not willing to give up the sale of $600,000 worth of jute in order to get $1 billion worth of products, as far as I am concerned India just does not have very good people at the head of her government.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman feel that we should drive India into the hands of the communistic Soviet Union merely by refusing to permit the sale of half a million dollars' worth of jute to Cuba, when they originally sold $11 million worth, and reduced it to half a million dollars?

Because of the selling of this small item, I do not think we ought to take the chance of permitting an underdeveloped country to be driven into the hands of Communist Russia. I do not think that is a wise thing to do.

Mr. BELCHER. I would say to the gentleman, if he is willing to say that we can ship stuff to Vietnam that they can shoot back at our boys and that India is going to have to go communistic—I am going to be against shipping anything that can be given as aid or comfort to the enemy.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. This has nothing to do with North Vietnam.

Secondly, the President, is the one who has the discretion himself to determine whether or not it is in the national interest that we permit India to do this.

Mr. BELCHER. I do not want to give discretion to any living soul to send stuff to North Vietnam to shoot American boys.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat disturbed that the impression seems to be, from some of the speeches that have been made, that Cuba is all of a sudden a friend of ours and that Cuba is the kind of country that is turning toward the United States.

I do not know how many Members of this body were here a few days ago when one of our colleagues, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ARCH MOORE], gave a speech concerning the number of Cuban refugees who have come to the United States at our expense—they number some 300,000 refugees. The gentleman pointed out that there are approximately 300,000 more Cubans who want to come to the United States at our expense to escape the dictatorship of Mr. Castro. It so happens according to our colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE]—and he is a very able gentleman in this regard as well as on other matters—that there are 2,700 Americans being held hostages in Cuba either in jail or being confined in some way.

It is my understanding that we have asked that these 2,700 Americans come to the United States as quickly as possible and Mr. Castro has said that none of them will come until all of the Cubans who want to come are able to come here—and that is 300,000 Cubans.

In other words, Mr. Castro is holding as hostages 2,700 Americans until 300,000 Cubans come out of Cuba. Do we want to help that kind of an operation? I do not think so.

Mr. BELCHER. I do not know whether Cuba is turning more toward the United States or not. I do not know whether that is true. But I would like to know what they are turning toward the United States?

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAN. The way I understand it is that we could not give aid to any country dealing with Cuba, and we could not give aid to any country dealing with North Vietnam. All of us agree on that—this is the way it should be. But I wonder whether or not we can give aid to a country dealing or trading with Russia under this bill?

Mr. BELCHER. This motion of mine does not go far enough to shut out all of the Communist countries. We have tried it many times but we have never been able to get enough votes to shut them out and unfortunately this only shuts out Cuba and North Vietnam.

Mr. CALLAN. But not Russia?

Mr. BELCHER. It does not shut out Russia. It does not shut out giving food to Indians who are starving or giving food to any other country where there are people starving regardless of whether they ship the stuff to Cuba or North Vietnam, either one.

Mr. CALLAN. The way I understand it then, we can give aid to an African country that is dealing with Russia?

Mr. BELCHER. You do not have a chance to pass on that today. The question that you will pass on today is, Can you ship stuff to Vietnam or Cuba?

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. I would point out that the gentleman from Nebraska apparently does not understand what you are attempting to do.

If the gentleman will refer to page 2 of the conference report, section 103, subsection (d) very clearly states that sales agreements are limited to "friendly" countries, and—

> As used in this Act, "friendly country" shall not include (1) any country or area dominated or controlled by a foreign government or organization controlling a world Communist movement.

That would include, I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska, Russia and China.

Mr. CALLAN. I thank the gentleman, but the fact remains we could still give aid to a nation who is trading with Russia if that country was not controlled or dominated by a foreign government or organization controlling a world Communist movement.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I as one who has long been deeply concerned about shipping to North Vietnam certainly want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for the leadership he has exerted in this area.

I would say to my colleagues in the House that we should not miss any legislative opportunity that is available to the Congress here to tighten controls against shipping to North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of insisting on the original House language to H.R. 14929, which denied sales of agricultural commodities under title I to any country which sells or furnishes or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba or North Vietnam any equipment, materials, or commodities so long as they are governed by a Communist regime.

As one who has been concerned for many months over the aid and comfort being given North Vietnam by free world ships I believe that such language is absolutely necessary. I think there is little doubt that the actions taken by the House in recent months to prohibit either foreign aid or Public Law 480 benefits to countries who are involved in this traffic with our enemy have been instrumental in bringing about a reduction in this trade. Nevertheless this trade still exists and it is still of vital importance that Congress should continue to put the world on notice that so long as one free world ship docks at Haiphong the American people will not be satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, I share the shock and indignation of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] that the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, has characterized this attempt to stop trading with the enemy by our so-called friends as "an effort to demagog an emotional issue as we approach an election."

This lack of concern, unfortunately, is not surprising. Last year in fact the Department of Agriculture awarded a food-for-peace cargo of 10,210 long tons of wheat to a Greek-flag vessel, the *Saronis*, which had been in a North Vietnamese port on January 25, 1965. On July 20, 1965, the *Saronis* sailed from Port Arthur, Tex., bound for India. It was only last February, 6 months later that the administration announced it would prohibit ships trading with Hanoi from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes.

Unfortunately this "black list" is not a fully adequate response to this problem. Congress, in the face of opposition from the administration, has taken a further step in denying foreign aid to any country trading with North Vietnam but this does not quite do the job either.

It is important, therefore, that every opportunity be taken to discourage any trade with North Vietnam. Certainly no piece of legislation should contain provisions which tolerate this trade. This traffic in fact has been tolerated far too long. The Secretary of Agriculture in behalf of the administration demands that we not hold it against any of our so-called friends if they help North Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot understand how it can be in our national interest to offer aid or subsidized Government business to any country which permits help to a regime that is daily taking its toll of American lives.

There should be no wavering of support here in Congress for the hundreds of thousands of boys sent to North Vietnam.

A few days ago while considering the foreign aid appropriations the House succeeded in tightening up its restrictions concerning this trade. There is no compelling reason today why we should appear inconsistent in our concern over the aid and comfort being given our enemy. We should seize every opportunity to express the American people's determination to oppose all free world trade with North Vietnam.

Mr. BELCHER. I just want to say in closing that I do not want to pressure any of you to vote for my motion to recommit, and I have never attempted to tell any Member of this House how to vote—use your own judgment and let your own conscience tell you what you should do.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the House managers to confirm my understanding of how section 103(m) of the bill would be administered. As I read the provision the purchasing country would first have to assure convertibility of such amounts as might be necessary to pay U.S. obligations not payable in local currency such as canal tolls for vessels owned by the U.S. Government, and similar charges. Then, in addition to that amount, in excess currency countries, convertibility would also be required of an amount that would be determined by calculating the expected normal tourist expenditure in that country, up to 25 percent of the currency generated by the agreement. However, the total which is to be convertible under this provision is not on top of the amounts required to be convertible elsewhere in the bill but is inclusive of these other amounts, since section 103(m) stipulates that this currency is to be used for sale to U.S. tourists "or otherwise." Currencies set aside under section 103(m)(2) may be converted, therefore, for use in market development and will be counted against the 5 percent downpayment required in section 103(k). Am I correct in my conclusions?

Mr. COOLEY. Your understanding of the effect of this provision is correct.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM].

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to confine my remarks to an area other than that which has been heavily debated today, and touch briefly on that which we debated at length when we passed the bill in the House.

That was the length of terms of sales.

As Members may recall, there was a difference of opinion here on 20-year terms or 40-year terms. The conference report now has come up with a compromise that seems acceptable, but I want to make a brief legislative history here for this act when it becomes law.

As I understand the conference report, 40-year terms can be extended if they are needed for the conversion of currencies, although basically 20-year terms should be used.

At the time the original bill was up, there were those of us who argued that the 20-year term put American agriculture at a disadvantage with other American items, and we held firm for the 40-year term.

I would still prefer that we did.

However, under the conference report 40-year terms can be used, and I feel that the Department should be shown an intent of Congress that we want American agriculture in these particular actions and transactions to be treated the same as any other American commodities. In other words, if 40-year terms are given to a nation to buy fertilizer or petroleum or pulp, paper, textiles, or anything else from America, I certainly believe that that same nation should have 40-year terms for the purchase of agricultural commodities from America. I am sure that this is what the conferees intended when they adopted this compromise in the conference report.

I am pleased to make this legislative history and trust that it will be followed in the administration of the Food for Peace Act.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should like to ask the chairman to point out the importance to the farmers and the agricultural community of our country of carrying out the food-for-peace program.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course this is vital to the food-for-peace program. Unless we pass the legislation, we will not have a food-for-peace program.

Mr. McCORMACK. The question of allowing, in the field of foreign affairs, a minimum of discretion to a President of the United States is what is involved. It might have serious effects upon the farmers and the agricultural community of our country.

Mr. COOLEY. I believe it would have a serious effect on the farmers of the country if we did not pass the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. That involves leaving a minimum of discretion with the President of the United States.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I am very interested in the apparent great concern some Members now have for the farmers. Anyone who has been watching the market in recent days and weeks must be concerned about what is happening to the farmers, the manner in which farm prices have been going down, precipitately going down.

In addition I have heard that we have already advised foreign recipient nations there will be but little wheat they can expect us to export to them, et cetera, in making probable there will be a further driving of farm prices on the part of the administration, under the direction of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman. Let me report, this is wrong, is wrong as can be.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me say, in response, the farmers have always been better off under Democratic administrations than they ever been under the other party.

I might also observe in my 38 years served in this body, and without one farm in my district, I have voted for every farm bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Would the gentleman read the statement which came out of the Department of Agriculture yesterday under the name of a high-ranking Democrat who has been serving for a long time under Mr. Freeman. The chart and information published in the paper clearly show what has happened in regard to farm parity ratio. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will read that, I believe he will find the facts a little disturbing.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this conference report, but I do wish to say a word about what seems to me the great importance of sustaining the report, and in support of the position well stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

I certainly do not associate myself with the attacks which were made by a member of the administration on a Member of this House in a letter that was offensively worded. But let us vote on the merits of this proposition and let us not be influenced by the irrelevant fact that an overly critical letter was written and sent.

I should like to emphasize that in my view it is terribly important that we distinguish here between North Vietnam

and Cuba. In one case we are engaged in armed conflict. In the other we are not.

We ourselves have shipped drugs to Castro's Cuba. Yet under the rigid wording of the original House bill, we would be trying to stop any such shipments by countries that receive Public Law 480 assistance.

Some of our best friends and biggest trading partners, including Canada and the United Kingdom, are trading with Cuba. How do you suppose the Government of India, a democratic government, would feel if we tried to tell them they could not have a little trade with Cuba, while our biggest trading partners do? How would the Indian Government feel, if we tried to use our aid to dictate what their foreign policy shall be?

Mr. Speaker, a distinction should be drawn here between North Vietnam and Cuba. I believe the President should be allowed discretion, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] suggested, to permit recipient nations to trade in nonstrategic commodities with Cuba under certain circumstances.

I urge the House to sustain the conference report.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is it not also true that free world trade with Cuba has shrunk very sharply? Is it not true that the administration, over a period of years, has made every effort to persuade our allies, whether big or small, to reduce that trade? Is it not true also that the developing nations, such as India, have reduced that trade and we hope they will continue to reduce that trade?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is certainly true, as the gentleman says, that India has reduced its trade with Cuba very sharply. We have made efforts to persuade our allies to cut down their trade. But we do not suggest that our trade with them should be cut off because they trade with Cuba.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], did not mean to suggest that the Secretary of Agriculture was taking a different position on this legislation because he was not on the front lines of Vietnam. It would seem to me this kind of effort to discredit the Secretary of Agriculture is not the kind of thing that the gentleman would attempt to do. I am sure he would recognize that the Secretary of Agriculture had a distinguished war record in the South Pacific where he was wounded and nearly lost his life in defense of his country in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I merely want to add my voice to those who say this issue centers around the problem of Cuba and not North Vietnam. The bar on trading with North Vietnam is absolute and there is no discretion. That is true regardless of what we do with this conference report. It seems to me to keep suggesting that there is a different state of facts is to try to mislead the House and, I expect, to try to mislead the public. The bar in the appropriation measure will not permit any goods to be sent to North Vietnam by a country that wants to be eligible for food-for-peace shipments. I do not know why the gentlemen who are defending more severe restrictions want to keep talking about North Vietnam. It seems to me the only purpose they have in mind is to attempt to create an emotional issue where there is no issue in fact.

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

Mr. FRASER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I was somewhat puzzled at a remark that was made on the minority side a few minutes ago. As I understood it, if India, for example, did trade with Cuba, then under this law we could give India wheat, but if India did not trade with Cuba, under this law they would then have the privilege of buying wheat from us. Is that correct?

Mr. FRASER. I think that is essentially correct.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman raised the question as to why we keep referring to North Vietnam. After June 30 of next year the act we are dealing with now will still have 18 months of life. At that point the trading-with-the-enemy amendment to the appropriation bill, sometimes called the Findley amendment, would expire. There is a legal question as to whether between now and June 30 the Findley amendment would apply or the looser language now before us. But there is no question but what the language recommended by the conference committee would permit nonstrategic trading to North Vietnam after June 30 of next year. So I think it is a pertinent point to keep making.

Mr. FRASER. I acknowledge what the gentleman says, but I say first of all that this is the first time to my knowledge that there has been any question raised about the effectiveness of the limitation that is in the appropriation act. I notice that the Secretary of State stated it is effective. The restriction in the appropriation bill can be renewed when the next appropriation for the food for peace is voted upon by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the RECORD should include the letter from the Secretary of State on this subject:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, September 27, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The House of Representatives will shortly be considering the conference report on H.R. 14929, which will extend and amend P.L. 480. I understand that some effort may be made to override the action of the committee of conference with respect to countries that have trade and shipping contacts with North Vietnam and Cuba. The administration believes that the provision in the conference report adequately supports our extensive efforts to limit Cuban trade. Any further broadening of the provision could have very serious foreign policy consequences and would undercut the humanitarian objectives of the bill.

As a result of conference action, the bill would forbid sale of agricultural commodities to countries that sell, furnish, or permit their ships or aircraft to carry arms or strategic items to or from North Vietnam or Cuba. There is no Presidential discretion in this; we ask for none.

At the same time, the current Agricultural Appropriation Act (Public Law 89-556) in effect prohibits any such sales to countries that sell, furnish, or permit their ships or aircraft to carry *any* equipment, materials, or commodities to North Vietnam.

When the President signed the appropriation bill, he stated that he was deeply disturbed about that provision, but it is now the law, and we will enforce it. If the same kind of bar were to be extended to Cuba—as was the case under H.R. 14929 before the conference action—our concern would be even greater. There are good reasons for this concern.

First, other countries may understand that we do not want strategic items to go to Cuba; they may understand that we do not want any commodities to go to North Vietnam for any reason; but they will not understand that we should want to keep even foodstuffs and humanitarian products from going to Cuba. Our own embargo does not go that far, and the OAS Resolution against trade with Cuba makes an exception for foodstuffs and humanitarian items. The reaction of these countries against such an indiscriminate policy expressed in our law could undercut our efforts to keep *critical* commodities from going to Cuba.

Second, some countries which the United States wants to support with P.L. 480 food sales may be unwilling or unable to pay the political price involved for them in cutting off all trade and shipping with Cuba. For example, Yugoslavia has foregone other forms of United States assistance rather than agree to altogether foreclose its ships from calling at Cuba. There are occasional voyages, but nothing very significant. Yet, Yugoslavia has good relations with the West and is now in process of rapid movement to a decentralized, market economy. This progress has basic political and economic implications for the rest of Eastern Europe. The major developing countries are also following the Yugoslav experiment with great interest. If Yugoslavia were cut off from our P.L. 480 sales program, the consequences to its economy may stop or reverse these favorable developments.

Finally, we believe that existing laws and policies have had good results in reducing free world trade with Cuba. We mean to continue our efforts to persuade other countries to avoid significant economic relationships with Cuba. We do not need to condition our P.L. 480 sales program, with its humanitarian objectives, to the single consideration of whether a needy country has trade or shipping contacts with Cuba, no matter how small or non-strategic. We should not risk such an absolute condition.

I urge the House to accept the recommendations of the committee of conference in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, apparently we cannot agree on what the conference report contains here, but if they

want to go to the chairman and the counsel over there, these gentlemen would get straight on it. This is not an issue only about Cuba. You cannot eliminate Cuba. You cannot do anything with Cuba if you do not recommit this conference report. There is no way of dealing with one of them separately.

You have to recommit the conference report and then the conferees can possibly determine what is to be done further and what might bring about a different situation as far as Vietnam is concerned. But this motion is to recommit the conference report which permits the shipping of anything except strategic materials both to Vietnam and Cuba. You cannot vote on Cuba separately from North Vietnam. So if you vote against motion to recommit this conference report, you are going to vote to make concessional sales to countries that furnish materials to North Vietnam.

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

Mr. BELCHER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think it is quite interesting to read what happened in the presidential campaign of 1960 regarding Cuba. Here is what the late President said at that time was going to be done at that time by this administration. He refers to economic sanctions and then he says, "We should also consider measures to prevent goods from being shipped to Castro via a third country." That is what we are doing in this very bill.

Mr. BELCHER. There is one thing further. I believe that the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives said that we were willing to give the President discretion on a previous occasion.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report has nothing to do with the discretion of the President of the United States, and unless we recommit this conference report, there is no way in which the President of the United States can exercise any discretion insofar as this law is concerned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, in order to just make the RECORD complete, I introduced a bill extending Public Law 480 on January 19, 1966. We had to wait to hear from the administration for approximately 1 month and when that message did arrive, I introduced the administration bill on February 14.

Mr. Speaker, we held exhaustive hearings and heard from everyone who wanted to be heard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I understand the situation here, the motion to recommit, which will be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] will require the House conferees to insist on the language of the original House bill, as it was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and as it passed the House by a vote of 333 to 20.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is sent back to conference, of course, the entire report is again in conference. We shall try to work out something satisfactory to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] if that is the gentleman's understanding of the situation?

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I understand the purpose thereof. However, I would like for the gentleman from North Carolina to restate the proposition.

Mr. COOLEY. I stated that the entire conference report will go back to the committee of conference, and we shall insist upon maintaining this position.

Mr. BELCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the parliamentary situation perfectly, but it is my understanding, however, that the conferees will only be given instructions to insist upon the House language insofar as this one section is concerned.

Mr. COOLEY. That is all I wanted. That is perfectly clear.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude this debate by saying that I certainly have no objection to the House of Representatives working its own will and I am certainly willing to go back to conference and do the very best we can thereon.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, my vote will be cast, for the third time in this session, for the restriction to prevent aid to nations dealing with North Vietnam.

While this may result in some difficulties in relations with some countries who insist on continuing trade with this Communist aggressor, it should very definitely operate to the economic and military detriment of the North Vietnamese.

It also provides additional proof to the world of our determination to back our fighting men in Vietnam with every resource and economic pressure in our possession. The effect of this should be worthwhile, both in Asia and throughout the world.

This is a vote, in my judgment, to do what we can with our great economic power to shorten the war in Vietnam, and to speed the day of victory for our forces and the forces of other friendly nations who are fighting for freedom there.

Let us hope and pray for such a result.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to one of the provisions in this important legislation which, despite its great significance to our domestic and international food supplies, has perhaps gone unnoticed on the part of many of my busy colleagues.

In the past there has been no congressional direction to the Secretary of Agriculture and the administrators of Commodity Credit Corporation concerning the preservation of adequate supplies to cover contingencies. Strict interpretation of law, I am advised, would have the Secretary of Agriculture move Government stocks until the last bushel, pound, or bale is gone and, more importantly, do this with no direction as to the price or return for such stocks. Until recently, when for the first time our commodity adjustment programs have been effective in reducing Government stocks to reasonable levels, there was no concern about this; but with the wheat and feed grain programs of the last few years keeping some 50 million acres of land out of production each year, our stocks are now down sharply. Therefore, the problem of resale price and of supply level at which that resale price should go into effect will have a great deal of importance in the years ahead.

It is for this reason that I offered an amendment during consideration of this bill by our House Agriculture Committee.

My amendment did two things: First, it told the Secretary of Agriculture to take into account in designing the commodity adjustment programs the carryover, the supply, and whenever that supply would be less than 25 percent of the total requirements—domestic, dollar sales, and food aid—he should adjust the programs so as to maintain such level. Secondly, the Callan amendment said that whenever stocks are estimated to be less than 25 percent of these total requirements there should be by law a higher resale price for any stocks coming out of CCC hands. In my amendment I suggested 115 percent of the current loan level. This amendment was approved by the Committee on Agriculture and adopted by the House. The other body approved somewhat more limited but similar legislation.

The conference report on the food-for-peace bill before us today contains most of that original Callan amendment—certainly the most important part. This bill says that whenever the supply is less than 25 percent—35 percent in the case of wheat—of the estimated export and domestic consumption—and this includes food-for-peace concessional sales—CCC resale minimum shall be at not less than 115 percent of the current price support loan plus carrying charges, and not less than 120 percent for wheat whenever its carryover is less than 25 percent of such estimated export and domestic consumption.

Thus, after many years of discussion, proposals, committee hearings on both sides of the Capitol, I am pleased to see that constructive and reasonable legislation has been included in this food-for-peace bill.

I am proud to have authored this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion to return this report to conference.

The House passed H.R. 14929 with an amendment that clearly provided that the United States would not send food under the food-for-peace plan to countries trading with North Vietnam or Cuba. The conference report which we are about to vote upon has struck down that provision.

I would like to go on record as opposed to the changed language and urge my

colleagues to vote down the conference language and ask that the report be sent back to conference with the recommendation that the House language be inserted.

We cannot compromise our thinking in regard to dealing with the enemies of the United States. And if we accept the bill as amended by the Senate language, we will certainly be compromising the freedom-loving people of the world.

We have offered food to the needy countries of the world. It is their decision, not ours, as to whether or not they take this aid. We have extended the hand of friendship.

They may take it in partnership with the United States. But they should not be permitted to take this food with one hand and then offer aid to the enemies of the United States.

We do not intend to bolster any economy that derives revenue at the cost of American lives. Approval of this conference report would be just that.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House approve paragraph (d) of section 103 of title I of the food-for-peace bill.

This paragraph clearly sets forth the policy of not permitting agricultural sales agreements with countries selling or carrying strategic goods to Cuba or North Vietnam. This provision further supports U.S. efforts to persuade other free world countries to curtail their trade and shipping with the aggressive Communist regimes in those two countries. It does not affect the provision in the Agricultural Appropriation Act prohibiting agricultural sales to countries carrying on trade in any commodities whatever with North Vietnam.

At the same time, it leaves sufficient flexibility to allow agricultural sales programs that are otherwise in the national interest with less developed countries even though they carry on some limited nonstrategic trade or shipping with Cuba, so long as they do not permit trade with North Vietnam.

The administration has made and continues with every possible method of persuasion to convince other countries to reduce or eliminate their trade with North Vietnam and Cuba. There has been considerable success.

Free world exports to North Vietnam are very small and are all nonstrategic—only $13.5 million in 1965. During 1965 an average of 21 ships per month called at North Vietnam while an average of 34 per month called in 1964. During the last 3 months only nine free world ships called at North Vietnam—all under long-term charter to Asian Communist countries.

In the case of Cuba, free world trade has dropped from $340 million in 1964 to only $175 to $185 million in 1965. A further clearance is expected this year. Furthermore, most of this trade was by industrialized countries of Europe that would not be affected by the food-for-peace legislation.

Free world ship calls at Cuba have dropped from 394 in 1964 to 290 in 1965 and will be even lower in 1966.

The President should be left with enough authority to make maximum use of the food-for-peace legislation. That legislation is intended to draw on our agricultural strength to help other countries toward greater independence and economic well-being. This is a purpose that strengthens the free world in a key sector. It is an important tool in coping with the evolving situation in the underdeveloped world.

I strongly urge that we leave the President free to obtain the maximum benefit from the food-for-peace program in its own terms. He can then continue to press for the maximum cooperation from other free world countries in matters of trade and shipping with Cuba as a separate matter, without encumbering the agricultural program, and with a prospect of further gradual progress in this field.

There is already ample legislation on the record to support the President in this latter effort. I would recall for the House, moreover, his statement in signing the Agricultural Appropriation Act:

> Second, the bill contains a provision that would automatically bar any needy nation from receiving U.S. food aid for its poor and starving people if that nation engages in any trade or shipping with North Vietnam.
>
> This absolute bar goes far beyond a measured response to the problem, for such transactions by countries receiving our food aid are currently very small. It is inconsistent with the humanitarian and foreign policy goals of the food-for-freedom program. It will tie the hands of this administration and succeeding administrations.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, one last-minute change worked out by the conference committee for the food-for-peace bill should be reversed by the House. I am referring to the deletion of the provision which would prohibit U.S. taxpayer-sponsored bargain-rate food sales to nations that are trading with North Vietnam and Communist Cuba.

The reasons for this House-passed provision are obvious. North Vietnamese troops and the Communist Vietcong who are supported by the North Vietnam economy are killing and maiming the American boys in their efforts to subvert and conquer South Vietnam. In January of this year Cuba's Castro was the official host to the first annual conference of the Communists of three continents. The conference approved a program to organize support throughout the Communist world for the North Vietnamese invasion.

The House provision simply denies taxpayer-subsidized food sales from our Government under Public Law 480, to various nations who may be tempted to trade with those two enemies of the United States. The provision in no way alters our humanitarian donation program for urgent or extraordinary food relief requirements of both friendly and unfriendly countries.

It is argued that the countries affected by this provision are sending only small amounts of "nonstrategic goods" to North Vietnam and Cuba. However, we know in our own economy, which is infinitely stronger than those of our enemies, that all goods are strategic during wartime. The supply of "nonstrategic" articles can be of great assistance in freeing a country's productive capacity for strategic goods.

Either way, the trade amounts to valuable assistance to the declared enemies of the American interests and the interests of the free world. We cannot justify special subsidized sales of American food to countries which choose to assist our wartime enemies in this way. The House must reinsert the ban provision.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Oklahoma opposed to the conference report?

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma qualifies.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. BELCHER moves to recommit the conference report on the bill, H.R. 14929, to the Committee of Conference with an instruction to the Managers on the part of the House to insist upon the language of section 103(d)(3) of the House bill which reads as follows:
>
> "(3) for the purpose only of sales of agricultural commodities under title I of this Act any nation which sells or furnishes or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba or North Vietnam (excluding United States installations in Cuba) any equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as they are governed by a Communist regime."

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

There was no objection.

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

The question was taken; and the Chair, being in doubt, the question was again taken.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, the noes appear to have it.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 306, nays 61, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

YEAS—306

Abbitt	Battin	Broyhill, Va.
Abernethy	Beckworth	Buchanan
Adair	Belcher	Burleson
Adams	Bell	Burton, Utah
Anderson, Ill.	Bennett	Byrne, Pa.
Andrews, George W.	Berry	Byrnes, Wis.
	Betts	Cabell
Andrews, Glenn	Blatnik	Cahill
	Boggs	Callan
Andrews, N. Dak.	Boland	Cameron
	Bolton	Carey
Arends	Bow	Carter
Ashbrook	Bray	Casey
Ashmore	Brock	Cederberg
Ayres	Brooks	Celler
Bandstra	Broomfield	Chamberlain
Baring	Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Chelf
Barrett		Clancy
Bates	Broyhill, N.C.	Clark

Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilligan
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morton
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—61

Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Bingham
Bolling
Brademas
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Clevenger
Cohelan
Culver
Dawson
Diggs
Dingell
Dow
Edwards, Calif.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gathings
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Helstoski
Holifield
Holland
Jacobs
Kastenmeier
Keogh
Kluczynski
Krebs
Matsunaga
Mink
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
Patten
Powell
Rees
Reuss
Ronan
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
Scheuer
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Waldie
Yates

NOT VOTING—66

Addabbo
Albert
Aspinall
Brown, Calif.
Callaway
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Fisher
Flynt
Garmatz
Grider
Gross
Halleck
Hansen, Iowa
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Kupferman
Leggett
McMillan
McVicker
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Murray
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill, Mass.
Purcell
Reinecke
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Tex.
Schisler
Scott
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tuck
Tupper
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Grider with Mr. Watson.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Albert with Mr. Halleck.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Gross.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Kupferman.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.

Mr. McVicker with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Schisler.

Mr. Dyal with Mr. Vivian.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Tuck.

Mr. Craley with Mr. Teague of Texas.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Sickles.

Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mrs. Thomas.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Resnick.

Messrs. GRAY, YOUNG, ROONEY of New York, and BARRETT changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE AUTHORITY OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL TO LEASE REAL PROPERTY

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 197) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 197

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2109 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2109. Time limitations on agreements

"Agreements may not be entered into under sections 2104 and 2105 of this title after July 22, 1964, and under section 2103 after April 30, 1967."

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 197 provides for an extension of the leasing program of the Post Office Department to April 30, 1967.

The provisions of title 39 United States Code, section 2103, authorizes the Postmaster General to enter into lease agreements for postal buildings for periods up to 30 years, and authorizes the condemnation and other types of land acquisition and related land disposition. This authority will expire on December 31, 1966, and the joint resolution proposes to grant a 4-month extension.

A 4-month extension was proposed by the Senate Committee on Public Works, which has jurisdiction over this matter in the Senate, in order to permit the committee to examine in depth the relative merits of providing some major postal facilities by Government construction rather than by long-term leasing. This is the same reason advanced by the Senate when the same question of the extension of the leasing authority was considered several years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the House passed a bill, H.R. 14548, on July 18, 1966, which would have continued the 30-year leasing authority indefinitely without any time limitation. The bill received extensive consideration by the Senate Public Works Committee and was reported by the committee with substantial amendments. However, the Senate was not able to complete action on the amendments recommended by the committee and now, since it is getting so late in the session, felt it advisable to provide a 4-month extension on the existing authority in order to permit a continuation of the Department's leasing program beyond December 31, 1966.

This will afford the Senate Public Works Committee ample opportunity next year for determination to be made whether to provide an indefinite extension of the authority or to meet the Post Office Department requirements for major facilities through Government construction.

SUMMARY OF ACTION BY THE SENATE ON H.R. 14548

The bill, H.R. 14548, was reported to the Senate on July 22, 1966—Senate report No. 1400.

Committee amendments propose to continue the 30-year leasing authority for "the erection by the lessor of a special purpose post office building." The special purpose building was defined as being one convenient for processing mail with at least 90 percent of the floor space devoted exclusively to mail-processing activities.

The Senate amendment also proposed a fiscal year limitation on the total amount of lease space to be procured, of 6 million square feet or $15 million annual rental payments.

Also, any special purpose post office building having a gross floor space exceeding 10,000 square feet could not be the subject of a contract until 60 days after the date of a transmittal of a prospectus to the House and Senate Committees on Public Works.

The Senate amendments were considered by the Senate, but the bill was referred back to the Committee for further study because of several questions raised during the Senate debate concerning the procedure previously followed by the Post Office Department under this leasing program.

The bill was reported to the Senate once again on September 7, 1966—Senate report No. 1591. The Senate apparently has been unable to schedule action on the House bill and in lieu thereof, adopted Senate Joint Resolution 197 on October 4, 1966, providing a 4-month extension.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS]?

There was no objection.

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

PROMOTING GENERAL WELFARE, PUBLIC POLICY, AND SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10860) to promote the general welfare, public policy, and security of the United States, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Connally Hot Oil Act by exempting States from certain provisions thereof."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONTINUED PROGRESS IN THE NATION'S WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and request a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the chairman of the committee has submitted to the Speaker a list of conferees on the bill which includes only one of the members of the subcommittee other than the chairman himself, who worked on the bill.

I would like to know if this is correct?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has a list of conferees which, if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, the Chair will announce.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the information I have is that those of us who served on the subcommittee handling this piece of legislation were not named to the conference committee, and will not be named.

Having made that observation, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. POWELL, PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Messrs. THOMPSON of New Jersey, DENT, GIBBONS, AYRES, QUIE, and GOODELL.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENSES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1028) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1028

Resolved, That, in carrying out its duties during the Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on House Administration is authorized to incur such further expenses (not in excess of $25,000) as it deems advisable in the United States, its territories, and possessions. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and approved by such Committee, and signed by the chairman thereof.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to clear up one matter here. There seems to be a misunderstanding about this $25,000 appropriation in the minds of some Members. In our committee this morning when we dealt with this subject matter, I asked the question, whether this $25,000 was to be spent in conducting investigations of the membership of this House as a whole and that it was not aimed at an individual or an individual committee. Some of us serve on some committees that seem to be always being discussed publicly and sometimes privately. Therefore, in order that it be clearly understood, this committee, investigating under the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has the use of this $25,000 to investigate, interrogate, and inquire into the behavior of every Member of the Congress and every committee. Is that true, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The $25,000 can be used in any way that the chairman of the full committee wishes to use it. It is not strictly limited to investigate the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the statement just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] and apparently assented to by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], that this $25,000 appropriation gives the subcommittee on accounts, as I understand it, of the House Committee on Administration, the right to investigate any or every Member of this House on any matter whatsoever.

As recently as yesterday, I looked into Jefferson's Manual, which defines the legal duties under the rules of this House of the Committee on House Administration. I do not find anything in that manual that would give them broad, sweeping powers to conduct that kind of investigation. I am concerned because shortly there is going to be before this House a resolution to set up a House Committee on Ethics and Standards and I want nothing to interfere with the creation of that committee.

I would not want to leave the statement that has just been made unchallenged in the RECORD and to leave unchallenged the understanding that the rules of this House permit the Committee on House Administration to have anything like the broad, sweeping powers that would be given to it according to the remarks made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The $25,000 that is being provided by this resolution is not for the subcommittee on accounts but is for the full Committee on House Administration, and the amount, as set forth in the resolution, can be used as the chairman sees fit. This money will come out of the contingent fund. It does not apply to a broad investigation of each individual Member nor is it strictly limited to the one Committee on Education and Labor.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman from Maryland was present at the meeting of the committee this morning when I asked that very question. If the minutes of the committee can be brought here, I think the answer to the point I have raised will follow along the lines that I have made clear here.

Is it then the understanding of the gentleman on the other side that this $25,000 is illegal, as the gentleman puts it, improper, for the committee to spend it to investigate the behavior of all the Members, but it is not improper and not illegal to investigate the behavior of one Member or one committee. Let us understand this. Let us understand what this is for.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I certainly did not say it would be illegal to use that appropriation to investigate travel expenses or other expenses that might be paid out of the contingent fund of the House for any Member. What I objected to was what I thought was language on the part of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the effect that this would give them broad sweeping powers which would make the Committee on Ethics and Standards completely unnecessary; and with that I would not agree.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I would just say to the gentleman as chairman of this subcommittee that it is not, as I conceive it, my duty, nor is it my desire, to investigate the morals and the so-called ethics of Members of the House. I will tell the gentleman since he seems to be very eager about it, I am not in favor of setting up any such snooping committee as that under any guise whatsoever.

So far as money that we give to Members and to committees to pay their staffs, we as a Congress have an obligation and a responsibility to see that it is spent in accordance with the law.

If a Member does anything else that is illegal, there is plenty of law to cover it and an Attorney General to enforce it and I do not want you or anybody else set up as a committee to say what is ethical and what is moral and whether a Member in private life should do this, that, or the other. My constituency will make that judgment, so far as I am concerned, about me and I hope your constituency does the same so far as you are concerned. I would point out to the gentleman from Illinois that the "witch burners" in the colony of Massachusetts alleged that they were doing God's will. I have serious reservations as to whether the innocent people burned, or God, viewed it that way.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Maryland yield further?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I certainly will not be the one to set up any committee of this House, as I believe the gentleman from Ohio knows. The Rules Committee I believe unanimously reported out a resolution which would make it in order for this House to vote on the question of whether or not it wished to establish a Committee on Ethics and Standards.

Mr. HAYS. Yes, and I have heard that two-thirds of the members of the Rules Committee have had second thoughts on the matter. I understand they are amending the bill right now to make it more airtight.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman from Ohio is correct to this extent. The members of the Rules Committee have informally discussed the idea of amending the resolution to provide that any charges would have to be in writing and under oath. I subscribe to that. I think it is a good idea. I would be the last Member of the House to suggest that action should be taken on rumor.

Mr. HAYS. I have already received and thrown in the wastebasket a couple of telegrams making charges against a couple of Members on the other side. I told one of them only yesterday that if I were writing a list of the 10,000 people that I most admired in the country, he would not be on it. Nevertheless, I am not going to consider, as chairman of this committee, any such unsubstantiated charges as that in a telegram saying that this man has done various unethical things, and that is the way it was stated. If anyone wants me to look into matters, they will have to make a charge and make it under oath, and we will hear them in executive session to be sure that they are not trying to smear the man in public.

Any investigation that I run will be run in accordance with the rules set down, and it will not be a trial of somebody in the newspapers, and then find out that he has been tried on page 1 and vindicated on page 20.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Maryland yield further?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I agree with everything that the gentleman from Ohio has said with respect to the manner in which these investigations should be conducted. The only point I have been trying to make is that I felt the jurisdiction of the House Administration Committee was not broad enough to cover matters other than those related to expenditures out of the contingent funds of the House.

Mr. HAYS. The jurisdiction of the House Administration Committee is broad enough to cover anything we need to do. Furthermore there was no House Administration Committee in Jefferson's day. I would refer the gentleman from Illinois not to Jefferson's Manual but to the Reorganization Act which created the House Administration Committee in the 1940's.

Mr. BINGHAM. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I made a point of order against the consideration of this resolution last Friday on the ground that it had not been considered at a meeting of the Committee on House Administration and that the members of the committee had not been advised of the purpose of the additional $25,000 provided for in the resolution. You sustained my point of order, Mr. Speaker, and referred the resolution back to the committee.

The resolution was only considered by the committee at a meeting held this morning. The members were advised that the additional funds were needed for the operations of the committee, and particularly for the carrying out of investigation responsibilities assigned to the Subcommittee on Contracts. The members were assured that, while that subcommittee is currently investigating the regularity of expenditures by the Committee on Education and Labor, its terms of reference are not limited to any one committee. The amount requested is modest and the resolution is appropriate and in order.

I am glad that proper procedures have now been followed. It is precisely because the investigation to be carried out by the subcommittee is so important—affecting the reputation of the House itself—that it should be launched and carried on in a manner that is not vulnerable to attack.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL STATIONERY ALLOWANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Administration Committee, I call up House Resolution 1029 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1029

Resolved, That, in addition to any amounts authorized by law, there shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives an additional allowance for stationery of $600. Such payment shall be made to each Member and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico serving as such on or after the date of adoption of this resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE SECOND INAUGURAL OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Administration Committee, I call up House Resolution 1034 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1034

Resolved, That the amount of $15,000, authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House by H. Res. 241, agreed to February 24, 1965, on vouchers authorized by the committee on arrangements for the

centennial anniversary of the second inaugural of Abraham Lincoln, incurred pursuant to Public Law 88-427, approved August 14, 1964, is increased to $30,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRIEDEL

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRIEDEL: Strike out "$30,000" and insert "$25,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. POWELL. 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. 13161) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 13161, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say a few words concerning this most important piece of legislation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred and eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the bill, but before I do I should like to pay tribute to the Members of the Committee on Education and Labor on both sides of the aisle for their fine support and to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], for the work he has put into this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to explain the purpose of H.R. 13161, a bill to strengthen and to improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools, through the amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

It was a proud moment in the Halls of this Congress when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act became law last year.

While substantial and significant improvements in the education of the Nation's children were made during the last school year, these efforts were just the beginning, just the first stirrings of what must become a massive and sustained transformation of American education.

Two recent studies of American education reveal the shocking inadequacies of education in schools which our children and youth attend:

Just this week came a report from the Department of Defense on the results of the Armed Forces mental tests given to 18-year-old potential draftees during the 18 months ending last December.

Over one-fourth of these candidates failed.

These are the war babies that we counted almost two decades ago. We have failed them. And, the number of young people who await a proper education has increased steadily since World War II.

Educational deprivations incubate the seeds of despair and discontent.

This Nation cannot afford this waste. We, who seek to show the way to nations over the globe in their endeavors to advance their economy, political stability, and standard of living through the establishment of productive educational systems, must put our house in order.

With the expansion of knowledge, much of it emanating from the halls of our great centers of learning, there is much more to be learned by the generation now in school.

We need to be ever more competent in helping them to master the wonders of our modern civilization.

H.R. 13161, as reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor, will extend for 2 years the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—Public Law 89-10—and Public Laws 874 and 815, dealing with aid to schools with federally connected children.

An extension of 2 years will enable schools to carry forward their plans and programs. We, however, shall want to review the progress under this legislation before 1968. We feel that this is a necessary step and therefore did not agree to the 5-year extension, requested.

We realize the advantages of long-term authorizations, but the wisdom of the committee was that it would be better to remedy any difficulties now and study the problems further.

The essential amendments made in this legislation seek to liberalize support for needy children. For example, Indian children, migrant children, neglected and delinquent children, and the children in outlying territories.

Moreover, changes in the formula for counting low-income children were made, by the use of a more up-to-date census of the children from aid to dependent families. In 1968, there will be inclusion of children from families with incomes of $3,000.

Other amendments are concerned with the support of administrative costs for the conduct of programs under this legislation, for the increase in educational materials, especially up-to-date text and library books, for much-needed research, and for further innovation in the educational process.

The total authorizations for fiscal year 1967 will amount to $2,185,048,000 or about $430 million more than the Administration requested. In fiscal year, 1968, we are authorizing $3.6 billion.

We are eager to take this legislation to the floor of the House because schools are opening over the Nation and there is immense urgency that funds be made available for the improvement of education at once.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the author of the bill and the chairman of the subcommittee that handled it [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, first let me compliment the distinguished chairman and all the members of the Committee on Education and Labor and especially the members of the General Subcommittee on Education for bringing to this House a bill which I feel should be supported by all the membership.

The amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have received most thorough consideration by not only the members of the subcommittee but by the full committee.

In my judgment, the amount involved in this legislation represents the minimum funds that should be authorized, if we intend to do justice and equity to the schoolchildren throughout this country.

Mr. Chairman, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was not funded, as all of us recall, until after the school year had begun in September of 1965.

Mr. Chairman, since that time, all 50 States have participated in this legislation; school districts in all 50 States have taken advantage of title I projects, and the achievements of the program have been tremendous.

Mr. Chairman, more than 7 million educationally deprived children participate in over 22,000 projects, directed by some 17,481 of the Nation's 24,000 eligible school districts.

Last year, in passing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Congress took a major step forward in assuring equality of educational opportunity for all the Nation's children. This landmark act provides vitally needed assistance in a number of ways to help improve the quality of education. I would like to talk today about this law and describe specifically how it has progressed during the past year and why it must be continued in the coming years.

The first part—title I—calls for grants to local educational agencies, through State departments of education, for meeting the special educational needs of the several million children in our Nation who have been deprived of educational opportunities equal to their abilities. These are the children of urban ghettos and rural outposts, the children from backgrounds of poverty and cultural deprivation which all too often precludes them from receiving the full benefits of standard educational programs.

The lack of an educationally favorable home environment has not been the only impediment standing in the way of educational achievement for these children; inadequate educational programs must

share part of the blame for their failure. Recognizing the close correlation between economic deprivation and educational failure the Congress enacted title I in order to make resources available for meeting the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children.

Although it did not get underway until after the school year had begun in September of 1965, all 50 States were involved in title I projects. The achievements of the program have been many. More than 7 million educationally deprived children participated in over 22,000 projects developed by some 17,481 of the Nation's 25,000 eligible school districts. It is estimated that two-thirds of these projects were directed toward improving communications skills—reading, writing, speaking—in recognition of the principle that language is the key to all learning. In addition, special services were provided: guidance and counseling; health care; social work services; food services; and, special psychological assistance. School districts purchased special equipment and educational materials. Teachers and teacher aids were hired and trained.

A small number of projects involved facilities construction when absolutely necessary to implement worthwhile title I projects. I might add that I think there is an urgent need for new and improved educational facilities in this Nation. But I concur in the opinion of the overwhelming majority of school administrators that, given limited funds, other types of projects will be of more immediate benefit to educationally deprived children in most instances.

I would like to quote from a report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of the Disadvantaged, a distinguished body appointed by the President and composed of some of our leading educators and citizens. In their annual report to the President, they said:

> Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, has for the first time, made available major resources to bring opportunity to those who until now have lacked even hope. It has directed the attention of educators toward the plight of the disadvantaged. It has provided to local boards of education the funds necessary to develop programs through which children can overcome the handicapping limitations of poverty-ridden environments. The record of response is already good. With more time to plan their campaigns, the States can be expected to do increasingly better. But it is important to keep the purpose of Title I in sharp focus. Solving the problems of the disadvantaged will require the best inventive efforts of public officials in all the States.

Some examples of the inventive types of title I programs implemented by the States last year include:

In my own State of Kentucky, a $23,000 title I program was funded cooperatively by Louisville and Jefferson County Boards of Education. Under this program, instructional and enrichment programs were provided for cerebral palsied children enrolled in a 6 weeks summer session at the Cerebral Palsy School in Louisville. This program offered special classes, field trips, recreation, and speech and physical therapy.

In Baltimore, Md., a three-phase reading and language program has been instituted encompassing the entire year: Regular school day, late afternoon, and evening—plus Saturday—and a summer session. A 1-to-1 teacher ratio, small group meetings, and special materials were used to assist the children in developing skills necessary for reading on a higher and more complex level. The program covered all grade levels.

In St. Paul, Minn., title I funds were being used in three quality educational areas: 54 additional teachers have been hired in order to reduce the class size in disadvantaged areas; an instructional materials center for science, mathematics, English, and social studies was established; and special programs for the mentally and physically handicapped were begun.

In addition to the previously cited projects for the education of the handicapped and for the general strengthening of instruction in school districts, title I programs also included a variety of other services which were extended to children living in disadvantaged areas. Thirty percent of the title I projects provided health services for schoolchildren; 25 percent of the title I funds supported summer programs; 7 million children participated in preschool and kindergarten title I activities; and, finally, over 60 percent of the projects stressed remedial reading and the development of language art skills.

The first year is only a beginning in meeting the needs of the educationally deprived and enabling them to break the cycle of poverty which has bound them for so long.

In order to continue the progress already made under title I, 23 States have already submitted projects for this school year and over 1,000 projects have been funded. Approximately 1 million children from 997 school districts are participating in these title I programs amounting to over $98 million.

There were some problems during this first year of operation: late starts in many projects, manpower shortages, problems of interpretation, problems relating to the design and implementation of quality projects, and so on. These were to be expected. What is remarkable is how few problems there really were, when we look at the number of school districts and children involved in the program.

In the area of private school participation, under title I the record is also a remarkable one. When this law was passed last year, the Congress made it clear that the law was to help all educationally deprived schoolchildren regardless of the school they attended.

The cooperation between public and private school educators has been more encouraging. Across the country, for the first time, educators from all schools are sitting down together and discussing the needs of all our children of poverty. This cooperation has led to a wide variety of imaginative solutions to meet the needs of educationally deprived youngsters.

Let me emphasize that this first year of Title I has seen a massive impact on the improvement of education for children so long neglected by society. A great deal more remains to be done, for we cannot be satisfied until every child in America, no matter what his race, or socioeconomic background, or national origin, or religion, has adequate opportunities to fulfill his potential. The start we have made is significant, but it is only a start; the extension of Title I which is now before the Congress will enable our local school officials to continue their efforts to improve educational opportunities for the children who need them most.

The Committee has recommended that $1,392,048,000 be appropriated to continue title I programs in the coming year. Eligibility for participation has been expanded to include Indian children in schools operated by the Department of Interior, migratory agricultural workers, and neglected or delinquent children.

Further, the proposed change for 1967 to use the latest available date on the number of AFDC children will provide an increase of over $94 million in title I funds available to local school districts.

The second part of the law—title II—authorizes grants to the States for the purchase of library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials. All children in schools across the country have felt the impact of this program.

State plans for 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands have been approved under this program and funds amounting to $99,977,800 have been allotted for these approved plans.

Responses to this program from both public and private schools have been enthusiastic. Many school districts in Arkansas established distribution centers and commented that because of Title II requirements they had organized the administration of materials and services in a much more efficient manner.

In addition, children in schools for the deaf, blind, and mentally handicapped participated in the benefits of the Arkansas title II program.

Many States have allocated part of their allotment for materials to be used in programs designed to meet the needs of children and teachers in special instructional programs. For example, Maine has allotted 12 percent—$63,099—of its appropriation to support library projects for special instructional needs in schools to demonstrate the values of high library standards. Nevada has funded four pilot projects at $4,598 each to demonstrate the use of school library resources in special instructional programs and the impact of an outstanding school library on the instructional program. In addition, some States have funded model school libraries or instructional materials centers.

Since title II is operated on a State plan basis, each State decides how to spend its money and what methods to use in both public and private schools.

The State plans describe the various mechanisms established in order to provide for the participation of private school children and teachers in the title II program. Certification has been received from each State attorney general that the State plan is consistent with State law.

In order to continue this support of higher standards in the coming year, a $105 million appropriation has been recommended by the committee. This will assist the States in narrowing the gap between necessary school library expenditures and the present level of spending. The States will also be assisted in evaluating the present status of their school libraries and in developing long-range objectives for improving school libraries by a recommended $50,000 minimum for administrative purposes. This minimum would particularly benefit 20 smaller States which could not effectively administer their programs using the current allocation for administrative costs.

The third part of the law—title III—calls for supplementary educational centers and services. This innovative program is having a major impact upon the schools of the Nation. More than 6,000 school districts were affected by the $87 million PACE program last year. As local communities continue to develop new and imaginative projects under title III, public educational systems will involve the total educational and cultural resources of the community including private schools.

The wide variety of projects proposed by local school agencies has fully justified the promise which we saw in title III when it was enacted.

Typical of the innovative projects supported under title III during the first year were these examples:

In Houston, Tex., a model educational demonstration center for mentally and physically handicapped children is being established.

In Providence, R.I., an educational laboratory theater for secondary school children will reach 154,501 public school children in grades 10 to 12 and 7,848 nonpublic-school children.

The science center in St. Petersburg, Fla., is open to all students in grades 4 through 12 in public and nonpublic schools. The center's program and laboratory facilities are available to all teachers in the public and nonpublic schools to supplement their regular classroom work.

Reflecting the enthusiasm of the local school districts for the title III approach to quality education, local administrators have been ingenious in utilizing available resources to house projects: an abandoned warehouse has been converted into an educational center, an old post office has been remodeled into a theater, and an unoccupied supermarket has been turned into a diagnostic clinic.

State educational agencies are also to be commended for the outstanding job they have done in reviewing and recommending projects. They have contributed substantially to the program's first year record of success. The committee has recommended that $150 million be authorized to continue title III projects in the planning and operational stages.

TITLE IV—EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES AND RESEARCH TRAINING

Experts from all parts of the educational community have been involved in the development of the national program of educational laboratories, the largest single effort under title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These laboratories, based in various regions throughout the country, have been working to study, develop, and implement educational innovation. Local schools, colleges, and universities where the research talent resides and State departments of education have pooled their talents to create these new institutions.

The training of educational researchers is the second major program of title IV. At present there are only about 500 full time educational researchers in the United States. The title IV research training program is designed to increase that supply and raise the quality of educational research personnel. It is my belief that good progress has been made toward achieving the goal of a high-quality research program that endeavors to achieve quality education throughout the Nation.

TITLE V—GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

During this past year, grants have been made to State education agencies to enable them to strengthen their leadership capabilities, identify their education needs, and take steps necessary to meet these needs. Most State agencies have moved decisively to evaluate their programs and to establish program improvement priorities such as staff recruitment, improvement of teacher education programs, and interstate coordination of developmental activities in education. The committee has recommended that $30 million be authorized for the coming year to help the States continue their initial progress demonstrated in identifying, planning, and administering their educational programs during the past year.

I want to emphasize that the progress made during the first year of operation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is only a beginning of efforts to provide quality educational opportunities to all. To assure the continuance of programs, the committee has requested a 2-year authorization. This will assure the State and local educational agencies that their program will be funded for 2 more years, thus stabilizing programs and plans which have been underway for the past year.

AMENDMENTS TO IMPACTED LEGISLATION

Recommendations of the Stanford Research Institute were accepted by the Bureau of the Budget in making certain recommendations to the Congress, which the committee rejected. These recommendations included three major amendments to Public Law 874 and a number of minor amendments to this act and to Public Law 815. The three major amendments would reduce the cost of Public Law 874 by $233 million which is a reduction of about 60 percent in grants to the local districts. The minor amendments were intended to eliminate minor inequities, improve administration and make certain technical changes. Some of the minor amendments would slightly increase costs while others would slightly reduce costs.

The General Education Subcommittee to which these amendments were referred held extensive hearings, taking testimony from the officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, from Members of Congress, from the affected school superintendents and from other interested organizations and individuals. It also received letters and resolutions from State legislative bodies, local governing bodies, parent-teacher's associations, and many individuals. Almost without exception the witnesses and the communications opposed the cuts recommended by the administration. Most of them favored the minor technical amendments and a number recommended expansion of the impact area program. The subcommittee carefully considered the testimony and after full discussion reported a draft bill to the full committee. H.R. 13161 which is now before you, incorporated the changes which the full committee recommends in the Federal impact laws.

The committee did not accept any of the three major amendments to reduce the cost of Public Law 874, but did accept all but one of the minor amendments recommended by the administration. One amendment was adopted that would liberalize the eligibility requirements for large school districts. The committee also recommended a 1-year extension of the temporary provisions of Public Law 815. I will outline briefly the amendments that were made, the reasons for not accepting the amendments to drastically cut the cost of the program and will answer any questions which the members care to ask regarding H.R. 13161.

ELIMINATING THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM RATE PROVISIONS

When Public Law 874 was originally enacted in 1950 it provided that the local contribution rate was the average expenditure per child for current operating expenses from local revenue sources made by comparable districts in the same State. The local contribution rate is the rate paid for each "A" category child; the child who lives on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property. One-half of the local contribution rate is paid for each "B" category child; that is, the child who either lives on Federal property or lives with a parent employed on Federal property but not both. This was the only rate of payment in effect for the first 3 years of the program. After extensive hearings and thorough consideration Congress added an alternative method of determining the local contribution rate by the passage of Public Law 248, enacted August 3, 1953.

This amendment provided that the basic method of determining the local contribution rate described above should

continue but that no school district should have a local contribution rate less than one-half of the State average cost per child. This alternative rate was felt to be advisable by the House Committee on Education and Labor because of the differences in the rate per child received by federally affected school districts in the various States. These differences resulted from the way the various States financed their educational program. Some States paid 80 to 85 percent of all costs from State funds and only 15 or 20 percent from local funds; other States paid approximately 50 percent of the cost from State funds and 50 percent from local tax funds; and still other States paid 80 to 85 percent of total costs from local funds, with only 15 or 20 percent coming from State funds.

Evidence was presented to the committee in 1953 that the average rate paid for an "A" category child in some States was less than $35. These were the States with high State-aid programs. In other States the average rate per child was over $200 per child. These were States with relatively high education standards and low State aid. Under this arrangement Federal funds paid 75 to 80 percent of the full cost of educating the child in some States and only 20 to 25 percent of the cost in other States. To state the situation another way the rate of payment was several times greater in some States than in other States primarily because of the way different States divided the educational costs between local and State funds.

As a result of this situation the House Committee on Education and Labor recommended and the Congress accepted an alternative method of computing the rate of payment which provided that no school district need take less than one-half of the average State cost per pupil. This alternative rate provision has been in the law since that time.

By passage of Public Law 85–620 in 1958, Congress added another alternative minimum rate provision. The rate provisions of this act were thoroughly considered by the Committee on Education and Labor in 1956 the year that I was chairman of the subcommittee which had the impact area program under its jurisdiction, but the second alternative rate provision was not enacted until 1958. This second alternative rate provision provided that no school district would take a lower rate of payment per child than one-half the national average cost. In considering this new proposal the committee found that the inclusion of one-half of the State per capita cost as an alternative minimum rate had been of great benefit to the federally affected communities in those States where a substantial amount of the costs each year are borne from State funds. However, the committee found also that very large gaps still existed between the rates of payment per child to districts in the various States. There were seven States where the average payment was less than $97 per child and 11 States where the average payment was more than $200 per child. The committee also found that it was exceedingly difficult for some school districts with meager financial resources to provide an adequate educational program for substantially increased school population unless they received a higher rate of Federal payment per child.

As a result of these findings the committee recommended and the Congress by passage of Public Law 85–620 added the second alternative method of determining the local rate of payment which as stated above was one-half of the national average cost per child. These three methods have been in effect for the past 8 years and were in effect for fiscal year 1966.

In 1964 Congress directed the Commissioner of Education to make a thorough study of the operations of Public Laws 815 and 874 and to submit a report by June 30, 1965, together with recommendations as to what amendments should be made to the Federal impact laws if they were to be further extended. The Office of Education contracted with the Stanford Research Institute to make the study which was completed and the report sent to Congress on June 30, 1965

The Stanford report included a number of findings and recommendations. One of these findings was that some school districts were paid more and some were paid less than the amount necessary to precisely compensate them for burdens imposed by Federal activities. They recommended that this situation could be corrected if the alternative minimum rates of one-half the State and one-half the national average were eliminated and the rate of payment was based solely on expenditures from local revenue sources in groups of comparable districts. The report alternatively recommended an entirely different method of determining the amount of the Federal payment to be made to a school district which was considered to be impractical by the Commissioner of Education.

In its current legislative program the administration recommended, as the Stanword report had done, that the two alternative minimum rates be eliminated and that the rate of payment be based solely on expenditures from local revenue sources. It was estimated that this would reduce the amount of payments to school districts by $108 million in fiscal year 1967.

The committee did not accept this recommendation because it would be placing the school districts right back where they were in 1953 before the first alternative minimum rate provision was added. It would mean that the poorest States and those with the highest State aid programs would receive the lowest payment per child and the wealthiest States where the need was the least would receive the highest payments per child. The committee felt that the present rate provisions in the act are sound and should be continued with the exception of substituting group rates for individually selected comparable districts.

THE ABSORPTION PROVISION

Under the law as presently in effect school districts must have enough federally connected children to equal 3 percent of their total average daily attendance to be eligible to receive assistance. If they meet the 3-percent requirement they get paid for all federally connected children in the district. If they do not meet it they do not get paid for any federally connected children.

The Stanford report felt that this provision was inequitable because only ineligible districts were required to absorb without Federal payment some federally connected children. The report recommended that the eligibility provision be replaced by absorption provision and that all school districts should absorb a percentage of federally connected children without Federal payment and get paid for all such children above that percentage. The report did not specify what percentage of the federally connected children should be absorbed.

The administration's proposal included a recommendation that each school district absorb without Federal payment a number of "A" category children equal to 3 percent of the total children in the district and a number of "B" category children equal to 6 percent of the total number of children in the district. It was estimated that this recommendation would reduce the payments to eligible districts by approximately $108 million in 1967.

The subcommittee and the full committee studied this proposal carefully and came to the conclusion that it should not be accepted for the following reasons:

It would reduce entitlements to some school districts so much that they could not operate their schools for a full term. The committee received testimony that some school districts would be forced to refuse to educate on-base children if this absorption provision were to be put into effect. This would result in the Federal Government paying the full cost per child for Federal operation under section 6 of the act. It would work an extreme hardship on many districts, particularly large districts. It would place the percentage requirement at which districts were eligible to receive Federal assistance much higher than it has been in the past.

Last year Congress reduced the eligibility requirements for large city districts, those with 35,000 or more children in average daily attendance from the 6 percent which had been in effect in the past to 3 percent, the same as was required for all other districts. This amendment was effective for fiscal year 1966 and 16 or 17 large school districts that had never before been eligible for assistance received aid for the first time under Public Law 874. The absorption provision recommended by the administration would eliminate everyone of these large city districts from eligibility and would have nullified the action taken by this Congress last year in the passage of Public Law 89–313.

In 1953 the administration recommended, and the Congress accepted, an absorption provision of 3 percent of the non-Federal children. This provision was deferred for 1 year so that school districts could adjust their budgets and operating plans to it. However, each

year Congress again deferred the provision and after several years repealed it entirely. In the report accompanying the bill in which this repeal was recommended in the House Committee on Education and Labor recommended that the absorption provision be eliminated because this was too great a number of federally connected children to expect school districts to absorb without Federal payment.

For the above stated reasons the committee felt that this absorption provision should not be accepted. Instead, the committee felt that an alternative means of meeting the 3-percent eligibility requirement, by making those districts which had at least 100 federally connected children eligible even though the 100 did not constitute 3 percent of the total average daily attendance in the school district should be adopted. This would provide that if a school district had as many as 100 federally connected children it would be eligible for assistance even though the 100 did not equal 3 percent of the total attendance. It is estimated to increase the cost by $32 million.

This amendment was recommended because it was felt that the problem faced by large school districts in making surveys of their federally connected children to determine eligibility under the 3-percent requirements results in some hardships. Large districts may spend as much as $50,000, $75,000, or $100,000 in making the survey only to find that they do not have enough federally connected children to meet the 3-percent eligibility requirement. It was also felt by the subcommittee that if any school district had 100 federally connected children it had a financial burden which was severe enough to warrant Federal assistance. As a result the committee recommended this minor liberalization in the eligibility requirements.

REVISED DEFINITIONS OF FEDERAL PROPERTY

Another amendment recommended by the administration which was expected to reduce the cost of the program by approximately $15 million provided that federally owned property leased to a private concern which is subject to tax on the leasehold interest would not be considered a Federal property for the purposes of Public Laws 874 and 815. At the present time, such property is considered Federal property for the purposes of the act but any taxes received by the school districts are reduced from their gross entitlements under Public Law 874.

The subcommittee found from the testimony it received that this is an exceedingly difficult provision to administer. It is not entirely clear when outleased Federal property can be taxed and when it cannot be taxed. Some States have legislation authorizing local communities to tax such property and some do not. For these and other reasons the committee recommended that this proposal not be accepted.

EXTENSION OF "B" CATEGORY PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 815

The committee also recommends a 1-year extension of payments for "B" category children for construction assistance under Public Law 815. Under the provisions of this act as currently in effect authorization for "B" category payments ended June 30, 1966. Testimony received indicated that many school districts that had substantial increases in federally connected children and no facilities for them would be unable to meet the eligibility requirements without an extension of the "B" category. This category of children accounts for about 80 percent of all children counted for eligibility and payment each year under this act. There is no other Federal program authorizing construction of school facilities and the committee felt that there would be many areas experiencing substantial increases in the enrollment of federally connected children who would be unable to receive Federal assistance to provide the necessary facilities for them.

MINOR TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

As stated above, the administration recommended a number of minor technical amendments to each act. These amendments were designed to improve administration, to eliminate minor inequities that have existed in the laws, and to reduce paperwork required by applicant school districts and by the central office.

But I do recognize that there are injustices in the impacted program, and we intend to continue our study. We intend to continue with our investigations and hearings, and we will give consideration to a reasonable absorption provision where we feel that it is justified, or make other changes in the law required by equity. But in my judgment the recommendations of the Stanford Research Institute were completely unrealistic, and that is where our figures are somewhat larger for the fiscal 1967 program than the administration figures.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Thirty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 336]

Adams	Holifield	Schisler
Addabbo	Johnson, Okla.	Schmidhauser
Albert	Jones, N.C.	Scott
Aspinall	King, Utah	Sisk
Ayres	Kupferman	Smith, N.Y.
Baring	Leggett	Steed
Brown, Calif.	McMillan	Stephens
Callaway	McVicker	Stratton
Corman	Martin, Ala.	Sweeney
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Mass.	Thomas
Dawson	Martin, Nebr.	Thompson, Tex.
Dyal	Morris	Toll
Edwards, Ala.	Morrison	Tuck
Ellsworth	Murray	Tupper
Evans, Colo.	Nix	Vivian
Evins, Tenn.	O'Brien	Walker, Miss.
Fisher	O'Konski	Walker, N. Mex.
Flynt	Olsen, Mont.	Watkins
Grabowski	O'Neill, Mass.	Watson
Grider	Powell	Weltner
Gross	Purcell	Widnall
Hanna	Reinecke	Willis
Hansen, Wash.	Resnick	Wilson, Bob
Harvey, Ind.	Rivers, Alaska	Wilson, Charles H.
Hawkins	Rogers, Tex.	
Hébert	Roncalio	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PRICE] having assumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, 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. 13161, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 356 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from Kentucky had consumed 19 minutes..

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, much concern has been recently expressed about the guidelines. Let me comment briefly on this matter. The Supreme Court of the United States in 1954 established the principle that the maintenance of separate schools for children of different races was unconstitutional. Ten years later, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was enacted to insure that Federal funds were not expended for illegal purposes.

In cases involving two Virginia school districts, the Federal district courts adopted school desegregation plans which had been approved by the U.S. Office of Education. In each of the cases, the Federal courts required the school districts to take additional steps in faculty and staff desegregation, which was not provided for in the guidelines at the time. The courts, in fact, have gone farther than the U.S. Office of Education in ordering desegregation of schools.

There has been much talk concerning the busing of school children to destroy the pattern of neighborhood schools. As I understand the phrase, "correction of racial imbalance," refers to the busing of schoolchildren from neighbor schools which have not been officially segregated but which, because of residential patterns, are racially imbalanced. The guidelines do not bear on this situation at all. The guidelines were established with the full approval of the Attorney General, to help local educational agencies in an orderly way to comply with the ruling of the courts and were provided in carrying out responsibilities imposed on the Office of Education by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. They only represent suggestions by the Commissioner of Education to the local school officials as a means of complying with the Civil Rights Act.

I am not here to say that mistakes have not been made. Certainly mistakes have been made. The Office of Education is not infallible. But to me it is remarkable to see, if you look at the list, out of 2,000 southern school districts I find that only 70 applications under title I have been completely rejected solely because the local educational agency failed to submit or tried to comply with the guidelines.

In the State of South Carolina, out of 105 school districts, only 2 have been declared ineligible.

In the State of Alabama, out of 118 school districts, only 11 are ineligible.

In Arkansas, out of 408 school districts, only 5 are ineligible.

In Georgia, out of 197 school districts, only 3 are ineligible.

In Mississippi, out of 145 school districts, only 16 are ineligible.

I do wish to point out that in my judgment this is a remarkable record. The Under Secretary states, however, that it has been necessary to defer or terminate Federal funds, where they have already received Federal funds, in only 241, and we have every hope that these districts will come into compliance, preferably by voluntary action.

That letter was signed by Wilbur J. Cohen in response to my letter of September 2.

I feel this bill deserves the support of all the Members of this Chamber.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. I wish to say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I appreciate the words he said in his description of this bill about my amendment, which will permit the poorer States at least to be brought up to the national average. Along with the gentleman, I hope, as he does, we will be able to retain this amendment, in order that the States which do not have the money to make the effort, though they are high in the effort index, will be able to have the kind of assistance needed to provide the excellence of education we definitely need for these young people who will go to other parts of the country and hopefully will be working in full employment some day.

Mr. PERKINS. In my judgment, the gentleman made a great contribution to the legislation in offering his amendment in the full committee. As the gentleman knows I originally offered the amendment in the subcommittee. I felt the amendment was of great importance and am delighted that in the full committee the Perkins-Quie amendment was adopted.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I should like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if his amendment will add to the cost of this legislation, and if he will tell us approximately how much money his amendment, which we are now discussing, will add to the cost of the legislation?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the gentleman that the best figures we can come up with are approximately $350 million. The amendment will not go into effect until fiscal year 1968.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The question was to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. He made reference to his amendment. Would that add to the cost of this legislation? If the gentleman knows how much it would add, would he tell us?

Mr. QUIE. I will accept the amount of money figure which the gentleman from Kentucky has said. It is hard to tell exactly how much, because we do not know exactly what the figures will be on the average expenditure in this year, in which we are now engaged, per public school child.

We do not know what will be in the budget for 1968.

As the gentleman from Michigan knows, there is an entitlement to school districts in title I of this bill. It will depend then on what percentage of their entitlement they receive, according to how much the Appropriations Committee provides for title I.

This is different from any other title of his bill, or from almost any other bill we have passed, for they carry an authorization of so many dollars in the title. This carries no dollars authorization. It has a formula of entitlement. Then there will be a determination by the Appropriations Committee as to what percentage of that entitlement the State should receive.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. May I support what the gentleman from Minnesota has said.

The Perkins-Quie amendment is based on justice, is base on equity, and is based on the fact that the money will be spent more nearly on an even basis.

Also it is based on need. It repudiates the kind of a formula which was passed last year that would give the most to those areas that already have the most. I hope as we get into the 5-minute rule that the Perkins-Quie amendment will be strongly supported, because it is fair. Let us decide what the total amount of the bill will be after the debate is concluded.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentlewoman from Oregon made a great contribution in this respect. She advocated going further and dividing funds from the Federal Government equally among all the schoolchildren in the Nation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 337]

Albert	Flynt	Mackay
Aspinall	Fogarty	Mackie
Ayres	Gallagher	Martin, Mass.
Baring	Grabowski	Martin, Nebr.
Boland	Gray	Morris
Brown, Calif.	Grider	Morrison
Callaway	Gross	Morse
Chelf	Halleck	Moss
Clark	Halpern	Murray
Clausen, Don H.	Hanna	Nix
	Harvey, Ind.	O'Brien
Corman	Hébert	O'Konski
Davis, Ga.	Holifield	Olsen, Mont.
Dawson	Jacobs	O'Neill, Mass.
Dickinson	Jones, N.C.	Patman
Diggs	Keith	Powell
Duncan, Oreg.	King, N.Y.	Purcell
Dyal	Kirwan	Rees
Edwards, Ala.	Kupferman	Reinecke
Ellsworth	Leggett	Rivers, Alaska
Evans, Colo.	McDowell	Rogers, Tex.
Evins, Tenn.	McMillan	Roncalio
Farnsley	McVicker	Schisler
Fisher	Macdonald	Schmidhauser
Scott	Thomas	Watkins
Sisk	Thompson, Tex.	Widnall
Smith, Calif.	Toll	Willis
Smith, N.Y.	Tuck	Wilson, Bob
Steed	Tupper	Wilson, Charles H.
Stephens	Utt	
Stratton	Walker, Miss.	
Sweeney	Walker, N. Mex.	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, 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. 13161, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 333 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.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the observations made by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] with regard to the provisions of the so-called Quie-Perkins amendment, and indicate I did sign the supplemental views on this point to spell out in careful terms my objection to the amendment in the bill.

I would state that the only virtue to the amendment I can see at this juncture is that it will not go into effect until 1968, which means we will have the time and opportunity to explore and explain this amendment to all the Members, so that it will become evident to them, as it is now apparent to me, that under this amendment, without regard to effort, without regard to requirement of effort, 100 percent Federal funding will go into 29 receiving States, and 21 sending States will send the money into those States. In other words, 21 States of the Union will not receive a single dime ever, forevermore, under this amendment, because they will always be above the national average.

This simply means a total rearrangement of the financing of education in our country, without serious and searching survey on the part of educational authorities.

I wish to say I do disassociate myself from this amendment. I believe the only virtue in it is that before 1968 we will have an opportunity to look at it. I believe even then we may be able to convince the gentleman from Minnesota that it is not in the best interest of our country that we make export States out of the industrial States and import States out of nonindustrial States and thereby upset the balance of financing education.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. CAREY] that no member of our committee, in my judgment, made a greater contribution in writing the legislation. We all have reservations at times about certain portions of any piece of legislation, but in this particular case, in the modification of the formula, we did not take anything away from anybody. We did not take anything away from the wealthy districts of the Nation but merely put a floor under the poor districts that really need the aid worse than any other

districts in the Nation. We said to them that you can go to the national average. In other words, we provided some additional money. All of the States have the right to make their own election as to whether they take one-half of the State average or go to the national average, whichever is higher. To my way of thinking, this goes right to the heart of Federal aid to education. It must be based somewhere along the line, on need. I feel that the committee did a great service to the legislation in adopting this formula change, because in the other areas I have always gone along—and so have all the other committee members—and as long as I am in this body I intend to go along with constructive improvements to educational programs whether they be needed in the cities, in suburbs or in the rural areas of this country. In the AFDC amendment, the cost of which was $100 million, the low-income States do not benefit anywhere along the line, but there is justice in the amendment and I support it. We should update the data because of its greater equity. We are just trying to meet the urgent needs of schoolchildren in this bill. I feel it would be serious discrimination and disregard of real educational need if we undertook to do anything less than going to the national average for fiscal year 1968.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I accept the principle of the Bell-Carey amendment that brings our counting of children up to date and which, of course——

Mr. PERKINS. I want to say that I agree with the gentleman. I supported the amendment, and I will support it in the future. I think it should have been brought up to date. You deserve much credit, you and the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], for sponsoring that amendment.

Mr. CAREY. Of course, all it does is simply let us count the children where they are now.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. CAREY. And I think it has great merit in that regard, but I hope that the chairman will continue to appreciate my position in this matter.

Mr. PERKINS. I do indeed.

Mr. CAREY. While my State and, of course, the city of New York are making a tremendous effort to cope with all of the insuperable problems of education which they have and now are paying into the Federal coffers 22 percent of all the Federal revenues, we are in no position now to participate in a new kind of funding arrangement where we will supply funds to 29 States of the Union, but we will not receive in New York State 1 cent of those moneys. That is why I must object to this type of financing.

Mr. PERKINS. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from New York, and I would feel bad myself if we had taken anything away from the gentleman from New York, but we do not take away 1 penny from New York City.

Mr. CAREY. If in the will of the voters I am returned here, I shall do so for the purpose of trying to prevent anything from being taken away from them.

Mr. PERKINS. I am sure that the voters will be eager to return the gentleman.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I wish to compliment the gentleman for doing such an excellent job in presenting this bill. Is there any provision in the bill, as we have it here now, that would authorize or is there any provision in the bill that will authorize funds which can be used for the purpose of busing schoolchildren from one school to another or from one administrative unit to another?

Mr. PERKINS. There is no such provision. Funds may be used as determined by the local educational agency and the determination of busing is a question of the local educational agency.

The Commissioner of Education has nothing to do with that. There is nothing in these amendments like that—which gives the Commissioner of Education any authority to require any busing.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Would the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] advise the Members of the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union as to whether or not it is the case that no amendment now contained in the bill pending before us in any way changes any provision of the act which was adopted last year with respect to any question of the financing of busing?

Mr. PERKINS. That is exactly correct.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one further question?

Mr. PERKINS. Briefly.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Is there any provision in this bill which would give to a local school unit an incentive, and that is more money?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, any such matter would not be contained in titles I and II. The language of the amendment to which the gentleman refers has to do with an amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there is no incentive contained therein which has anything to do with busing. The provisions to which the gentleman must have reference in his question is the new provision of title III, which says that application of local school districts for title III funds shall be given special consideration, if the district is eligible for its application. And really, it has nothing to do with the facilities question, the question of transportation of students.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. I share the views as expressed in the statement on the part of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to cite some figures to the gentleman from New York to the effect that 23 States would have to contribute to the national fund in order to equalize this situation.

Mr. Chairman, I might point out that the per capita income spent for education in New York was 4.9 percent, while the poorest State of the Union, one of the lowest expenditures per school, per child, was 6.27 percent based upon its per capita income.

Mr. Chairman, based upon these figures, I believe that this formula is an unfair one, one which lets the poor States share a greater burden for carrying out its responsibilities for the education of its people.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the political situation and the political interest in which we find ourselves, where those of the richer States are to benefit most, we at least ought to come to the resolution as to why we want Federal aid to education to eliminate these problems, and that is to help the poor States and poor areas in order that they may be able to provide as good education to their children as can be provided in the richer areas such as the city of New York or New York State.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Minnesota has made a good point because we have got to take into consideration the per capita income and effort expended thereon.

There is nothing wrong with that in adding the income of A, B, and C together, and if the resources are not there and they are making a greater effort, special consideration should go to those school districts. And that is all that this formula does.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINO. I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding to me.

I would like to refer to the colloquy between the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from North Carolina regarding whether or not there is any provision in this bill on busing. I would like to bring to the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky that on page 52 of the bill, where we gave a new definition to "current expenditures," we say:

> The term "current expenditures" means expenditures for free public education, including expenditures for administration, instruction, attendance and health services, pupil transportation services—

Will the gentleman from Kentucky tell us exactly what that does mean?

Mr. PERKINS. It simply means this to the local educational agencies, that if they come up with a plan and want to spend part of these funds to transport some of their schoolchildren, that they have that right. The current expenditures mean the expenditures at the State and local level, and it merely includes transportation if that is a necessary expense at the local level.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINO. You say it is left to the local board, or the local administrator?

Mr. PERKINS. It must originate at the local educational level.

Mr. FINO. So that if the local administrator wants to force busing of children, then he is within the confines of this section?

Mr. PERKINS. No; that is not the case. This simply means that you have some of these funds under the local educational agency, and if they do want to spend part of these funds for transportation purposes they can, but not the type of busing you are talking about.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is trying to read something into page 52 that is not there. He is trying to take a phrase out of context, and put a meaning on it that is totally inconsistent with the meaning of this legislation.

This is nothing new in this legislation, it was in the bill last year.

What the gentleman is doing is reading a portion of the precise definition of "current expenditures", which is necessary so as to determine how much money, after you count the number of children you are going to take into account for the purposes of the formula in title I, how much money it will take to come up with one-half of the per-pupil expenditure, as we did in the bill last year.

We had in addition to this provision an incentogram, which we relied on very heavily, for this precise definition of expenditures. And all that the language on page 52 does is to define current expenditures for a child to include several items, including bus transportation, if that school district wishes to use some of its funds for the purpose of providing bus transportation, as it did in the bill for crippled children, or whatever cause it is.

This is considered a top educational expense, just as it was on books and all other expenses, heat, lights, buildings, and so on, at the school that is to maintain an educational agency, and not as suggested by the gentleman from New York, that this in any way would encourage the additional expenditures, so that a suggestion as to school busing is completely out of context with the meaning and intention of this legislation.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I can appreciate the concern of my colleague from New York. I know he is dedicated to the excellence of our educational system in our city. But I will advise him that this is an extension of last year's legislation. It was not a forced-busing bill in New York City last year, and it is not a forced-busing bill in New York City this year, and any attempt to make it so would do a disservice to the problems of our city. I want to warn the gentleman that in this connection there are very important pupil transportation costs which I know he would support that have to be taken into consideration.

For instance, all of the handicapped and crippled children in our city have to be transported to centers of instruction. I do not think the gentleman would be against supporting some of the cost for that.

I think the gentleman realizes due to the big increases which have been put upon the residents of New York City by the present administration, we have increased the pupil transportation costs for children who go to schools and use the public transportation system. This is subsidized by the board of education and it is especially subsidized for these poor children who have to go to secondary schools and who have to get passes for the subway, and if they do not get the money, then these kids will not be able to get to school.

This has nothing to do with integration. It has nothing to do with forced busing.

All it is, is simply for the children who live a remote distance from the schools that they have to attend.

Pupil transportation is a legitimate expense and I know as a longtime New Yorker and as one who is dedicated to the excellence of the educational system in my city, that my distinguished colleague from Bronx County, would not be opposed to any of these things.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINO. I want to associate myself with my colleague, the gentleman from Brooklyn, and say that I agree with him if the purpose of this legislation is to do exactly what he has said it will do.

But my fear is that the administrators of this program will be certain to force busing of these children under this new definition as contained in this section.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I think I can work in concert with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, on this matter.

There are suggestions that reforms are being made in New York City's school system and perhaps under some of these reforms we will have greater advances in the conduct of the school system by the people of the city of New York. I am in favor of that. I think that is the proper forum in which we should discuss that, and I would like that to be done with Federal funds in New York City.

I am not thoroughly excited and aroused or encouraged by the attitude of the board of education in all instances and I hope that the gentleman and I as good New Yorkers can wake up New York City to do something about that in a constructive way.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The gentleman from Kentucky will recall that last year when this bill came before us, there was some discussion about a church-state issue that some people thought they saw in this legislation. That legislation became law and has been operating for a year. Would the gentleman from Kentucky say it has been operating successfully during that year?

Mr. PERKINS. It has worked out remarkably well. We heard numerous witnesses from all over the country. Local educational agencies are sitting down with the private school people and working out plans and it is working well.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman's analysis and I would like to ask him if this bill before us today makes any change whatsoever in the church-state relationship established in the bill that we enacted last year.

Mr. PERKINS. This bill before us today and these amendments do not make any change whatsoever. In fact, we do not touch that section at all in these amendments.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that we have built and are building schools under our aid programs in many foreign nations throughout the world. Since I have been here as a Member of the Congress, under the Marshall plan we spent about $120 billion in other countries. I supported most of that program. But these amendments today provide the minimum that we should authorize for elementary and secondary education in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am most hopeful that the Committee will go along and support all of these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] has consumed 49 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

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

Mr. Chairman, as predicted when we passed this legislation originally, we now have an ongoing program—in some respects—going in the wrong directions—but it is going.

The local school districts and the local educators are dependent upon the money. Hired personnel have set up special programs and we here in October of this year are considering whether we are going to continue the legislation at a time when most of your school districts already are operating under the legislation.

We are, therefore, faced with the situation, of saying, Perhaps there are many things wrong with this program but we certainly cannot just end it and leave the school districts carrying the burden by themselves which they have been stimulated and encouraged to undertake with Federal funds.

The major problem, as was pointed out in the original debate, in the committing of this country to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was the lack of intelligent priorities in the legislation. It has become embarrasingly apparent to the original advocates that their main argument for the bill was fallacious. The main argument was that there are many poor areas in this country that cannot meet the needs of education. They have to have assistance. The Federal Government should equalize for these areas.

We talked about Mississippi, West Virginia, and a variety of other States with lower per capita income and presumably less taxable property available.

But what kind of bill do we pass? We passed a bill that gave more money to the rich States than it did to the poor States on the basis of the same number of children.

We outlined this in our original minority views. It is outlined once again in the minority views to this bill. I would call your attention to it without belaboring it today. It is on page 117 of the committee report.

The 10 wealthiest counties in the country get almost twice as much money as the 100 poorest counties in the country, with relatively the same number of poor children. It was supposed to be an equalization bill. I am standing here today from the State of New York, which has the highest per-capita per-pupil expenditure, and we are getting more money for the same number of poor children than any other State sent into each county in New York.

What has been the compromise the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] and others on this side of the aisle have been attacking? The Quie-Perkins amendment, if you will. This is an amendment that simply provides that the poorer States that are spending below the national average per pupil will be reimbursed on the basis of the national average. They will all be raised. They will all get increased money up to the national average per-pupil expenditure.

Those States that now qualify for more money per poor pupil will continue to qualify under the same formula as the existing act. No money will be taken from New York, from Ohio, from Michigan, or from any of the States that are spending considerable money per pupil. We will just start to equalize this benefit to the poorer States.

Certainly the major argument as it was presented for Federal aid to education over the years was that there are many States that cannot sustain a real property tax or other type of tax sufficient to give their children a good education, and this is a national responsibility. That was the argument that was used.

Then we enacted an act that made the rich States richer and the poor States relatively poorer in terms of the program.

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

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

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As the gentleman knows, I supported the Quie-Perkins amendment. I think it does represent a compromise. However, I do not completely agree with the point which the gentleman is making with regard to wealthy counties.

In the case of Westchester County, we still have one in five families living in relatively serious poverty, and one in twelve in abject poverty.

As the gentleman knows, counties do not in general support or maintain schools. The local school district must raise the funds for school construction and equipment. The local school district pays the salaries of the teachers. In the city of Mount Vernon, N.Y., where we have some serious problems in the schools, where there are serious pockets of poverty, the median family income is $6,800; it is not $8,000. The Mount Vernon Board of Education is now spending $12 million per year to educate 12,000 children in the public school system through grade 12—or an annual expenditure of $1,000 per pupil. This is an increase of $2 million from $10 to $12 million in the past 2 years.

The superintendent of schools in Mount Vernon has informed me that the board of education is within a few dollars of the constitutional tax limit and its capacity to tax further is negligible. While there is a major increase in spending and severe problems to overcome, the city faces a period of possible declining revenue through property taxation. Westchester County's median family income will not help Mount Vernon.

Frankly, there are important areas, particularly with the handicapped, where the city is now spending a great deal on a child, and this kind of school district, the Mount Vernon School District, needs assistance. Over the past year and a half, Mount Vernon has increased its per pupil expenditure for the handicapped, retarded, and those suffering from cerebral palsy by 150 percent. I think the thrust of the act is to reach the children, and to reach the children in low-income families, and not to deprive local school districts because they may or may not be part of a county listed as among the 10 wealthiest counties in the country.

Therefore, I believe the gentleman's argument would have more force if it were directed to the fact that essentially we are concerned with the district itself and not the county, because the county does not put up the funds.

Mr. GOODELL. I can understand the gentleman's position, since he represents one of the 10 wealthiest counties I was talking about.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman.

I merely wanted to comment that the observation made by my colleague from New York, [Mr. REID], who has made a splendid contribution to this legislation, I concur in. I believe he has put his finger on exactly the point of this legislation and the philosophy of the legislation, which might be badly abused by the permanent adoption of the Quie-Perkins formula.

We seek to reach the unit of society most in need. We seek to reach the family and the child. To start dealing in State averages, formulas and State boundaries might in a serious way impair our effort to find the child in need.

The genius of the bill is that we can reach the poor child in Westchester County and we can reach the poor child in Bogalusa.

Mr. GOODELL. The unhappy fact is that the law wrote in a State expenditure per pupil as the basis for the allocation formula. We are not introducing that for the first time here. That was the way the formula was put in, that the payment be in accordance with the amount being spent in that State per pupil.

This means that the State which is spending, as New York is, about $790 per pupil on the average, will get more money than the State down at the bottom of the list, spending $350 or $400 per pupil.

I believe the gentleman will have to agree that this contradicts the philosophy that we are going, supposedly, to give the money to those areas which cannot afford to raise taxes, or primarily to those areas which cannot afford to raise taxes to support schools.

Mr. CAREY. I can see some degree of merit in trying to reach out for the areas absolutely without revenue sources to help the children. I believe we can arrange to do that if we continue to rework the formulas.

However, I cannot agree that we should ignore the per capita family income as a factor merely because we have a very low per capita family income in the 29 States which would benefit under this legislation.

The inequity of the Quie-Perkins formula—and I might say the iniquity—is that it does not require additional effort on the part of the poorer States. It is a 100 percent Federal contribution.

The worst part of that is that we had an effort measurement item in the bill, which was taken out. We took out the special incentive grants which would have rewarded the wealthier and more fortunate States. That is no longer in here.

The worst part is that we do not require an additional effort, so they will always be below the national average, and that is the danger of the formula.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague from New York that I do not share his concern. If we took anything away from any poor educational district in a wealthy county, then I would share his concern. But in every

instance this money is to be disbursed on a factor of the family income of the children. Whether a local school district is making an effort or not making an effort, is irrelevant to the problem of meeting the needs of educationally disadvantaged youngsters. We are not overlooking the educationally deprived child who lives in the wealthy district as the gentleman's proposal would do.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Every State, in order to qualify for assistance under this program, must maintain its effort in support of elementary and secondary education. It may not use Federal funds to supplant local and State funds.

I repeat, we will not take funds from the poorer districts nor from the wealthy counties which are needed to meet the needs of deprived or handicapped youngsters. We will just give to those poorer districts, wherever they may be, anywhere in the country, a minimum amount per child to assure adequate programs.

Mr. GOODELL. Would the gentleman repeat what he has just said about the requirement that they maintain the present level and increase the commitment to education?

Mr. PERKINS. The law specifically requires that all States and local districts, in order to qualify for title I grants, must at least maintain their current levels of support for elementary and secondary education. States and local districts may not use Federal funds to supplant State and local support of education.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. If one would look at the percentage of poor children from poor families with less than $2,000 in Westchester County, you find it amounts to 3 percent. If you look at the similar expenditure of money in the State of Kentucky, in Jefferson County they have to have 15,000 such children in order to secure anywhere near that same amount of money as Westchester County, N.Y., with 6,000 poor children. If we would continue this kind of an expenditure into the wealthier counties, you would assume that no one has the responsibility for the education of poor children in the country.

The reason for this legislation is to help educationally deprived children and not just poor children. Poor children are counted in order to get the money into the school districts. The whole thing is mixed up, especially since there is no definition of "educationally deprived" in the act. I expect that the counties and the States wealthy enough to pay the high payment to welfare recipients could afford to educate their children, while the amendment we adopted in this bill includes none of the AFDC children, no matter how much the welfare payment is.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me further?

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

Mr. PERKINS. I think we should make clear the fact that the legislation clearly requires the maintenance of effort on the part of the States and I address the gentleman's attention to section 207 (c) of the act.

Mr. GOODELL. I might give you another example.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Then I will yield to the gentleman from Westchester County in just a moment.

I would point out that this underlines our whole point here. I was talking about the lack of priorities in this legislation. No one is going to say that we should do anything about the 3 percent of poor children in Westchester County or in Montgomery County 5½ percent.

But in Montgomery County, right out here, the median income is $9,317. They have 5½ percent of families with under $3,000 income according to the 1960 statistics. There are 44.6 percent with over $10,000 income in Montgomery County. Montgomery County under this allocation formula ends up with $555,726, based on this 5½ percent of poor children. Now, Montgomery County is listed, according to the 1960 census data, as the richest county in the country, the wealthiest, with $9,317 median income.

This means in effect we are saying that no counties, no matter how rich, no school districts, no matter how rich, can tax their people sufficiently to take care of their own and to see that their schools are of high quality. The poor children in Montgomery County can go to the schools in Montgomery County. I have never heard it charged that they are refusing to take children because of their poverty or because of their lack of wealth in Montgomery County or in any other county in this country. Presumably they have the opportunity to go to these same schools that as far as I am aware, are of very high quality.

I am talking about Montgomery County. I shifted to Montgomery County simply because I wanted the gentleman from Westchester County to know that I am not aiming at him alone in this matter. I do think there is a limited amount of money that we should spend for education and we should spend it in the areas of the highest priority and in those areas that have the greatest need. This is the one argument I have always used forcefully in favor of a Federal program for education; that is, that there are areas that cannot meet these needs. Every dollar of aid that we send in to a wealthy county comes away from one of the poorer counties because we have a limited amount of money that we can appropriate and which we can authorize. We know we are having difficulty with our budgets in this respect.

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

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Let me say to the gentleman, who knows my area, that one of the wealthiest towns in the United States is the town of Amherst in my district, which is about on a par with Montgomery County. The people who reside there would be in favor of this amendment because they would rather not have this money coming in there on the basis of a very small percentage of families with incomes of under $3,000.

They feel that they can take care of these children themselves. They are ready, willing, and able to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's amendment has a great deal of merit and certainly I want to support it.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman from New York.

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

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

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add one further comment with respect to both the remarks of the gentleman in the well [Mr. GOODELL], and my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The only point I am making, it seems to me, is that in terms of principle, the thrust of this legislation is to reach the educationally deprived wherever they may be.

Mr. Chairman, to talk of wealthy States and wealthy counties misses the point. The question here is to reach the children from low-income families and the educationally deprived.

In my judgment we have got to do this by going into the areas where this situation exists and dealing with the appropriate mechanism—the local school district.

In addition, we must recognize that there is a cost differential involved here. It costs more to construct buildings, to maintain them, and to educate children in Westchester County than in rural areas of the South.

Mr. Chairman, the poor in Westchester County have just as much need for assistance as the poor anywhere else. If anything, poverty amid affluence emphasizes the serious consequences of an inadequate education. It is essential that we reach and help these children.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am fascinated by the exchange between the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], both of whom are supporting the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and the great concern which is shown for Westchester County, one of the 10 wealthiest counties in the United States and for the extremely poor counties which were mentioned and which are located in the State of Louisiana.

But, Mr. Chairman, what does the Quie amendment do for the factory worker or for anyone else who is making about $6,000 a year?

Mr. GOODELL. Does the gentleman want us to do everything in one section of the bill? Presumably he does. We have to put the money into the areas of the greatest need. We have a limited budget and a limited amount of money, and we have set the highest priorities thereon.

If the gentleman will take the example of Westchester County, with an enrollment of 7,692 children who qualify as being poverty stricken, and Sunflower, Miss., where there are 9,542 children qualifying, that means that there are 2,000 more impoverished children in Sunflower, Miss., as are in Westchester County. Yet, Westchester receives $2,812,502 and Sunflower receives $1,156,611, less than one-half the amount which goes to Westchester.

Mr. Chairman, what kind of equalization formula is this? What kind of formula is this? Is it designed to help the areas that cannot afford to help themselves and support good schools?

I think it is very contradictory, as we felt in the original legislation.

Mr. QUIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. We must bear in mind what the intent of title I of this act is. The intent is to help the educationally deprived children, not to help the overcrowding of schools in the suburbs, not for any other purposes that one might be in favor of for Federal assistance to education, but to help the educationally deprived children.

So the only formula we have here is to count the children of the poor people. One would expect that in a school district where 3 or 2 percent of the children are poor that the nonpoor would provide as good an education for the poor children as they would for the children of the wealthier.

Every school district of the country cannot be educationally deprived, there must be some of the school districts that do not educationally deprive children.

We see in the large cities, for instance, in Harlem, where everyone recognizes that children are educationally deprived. Most of them came from either Puerto Rico or from the southeastern part of the country at one time. It seems to me that it is completely contrary to good judgment to penalize the area of the country where these people came from where we know that there are educationally deprived children. A study made by the three departments, the Department of Labor, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has shown that in South Carolina, for instance, 52 percent of the young men fail their preinduction examination for entrance into the service. We know that they are educationally deprived.

Surely the wealthier counties of the United States can do a good job of educating their poor children and are not likewise deprived. The poor children in Montgomery County go to the same schools that my children go to, or that of the children of my colleagues. Surely wealthy Montgomery County can afford to educate her children and the poor children receive the same education as the wealthy.

Mr. GOODELL. And they have the same facilities.

Mr. QUIE. They have the same facilities, they have the same teachers, the same everything for them, and they cannot be any more deprived than the wealthier children.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Kentucky observed a few moments ago—twice, I believe—that the $400 million to finance the Quie amendment would not be taken away from any other part of the country to give to the 29 States that might be the beneficiaries. I understood the gentleman in the well to say, however, that we have a bill here that deals with a limited amount of money on the basis of priorities and that he fears the priorities would be to limit the amount of money for use in the areas inhabited by those people that they identify as pockets of poverty.

In the light of that understanding, the gentleman in the well would be disagreeing with the position of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] that no money is being taken away from anybody.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. As I stated, it is additional money, it will go to the local educational agency as I have described. The poor district will greatly benefit from this additional money but this will not affect the allocation to any other local educational agency.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree. Let me say that at the very beginning, when we presented our views on this and offered amendments to implement it in the original debate, that we felt that this was to be a program that was aimed at helping those areas of the country that obviously cannot help their own children. That was the argument.

Then we came forward with a bill that went in the exact opposite direction, which made the rich States and counties richer, and the poor counties and States relatively poorer in terms of the impact of this bill.

The gentleman from Kentucky was stating, and I think accurately, that the allocation formula will remain the same. We are not taking anything away in the allocation formula from those States that are above the national average for pupil expenditures. We are adding additional amounts to take care of those that are at the bottom of the ladder. And that, I think, was an accurate statement with which I agree.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 338]

Adams	Harvey, Ind.	Roudebush
Addabbo	Hébert	Schisler
Albert	King, N.Y.	Schmidhauser
Aspinall	Kupferman	Scott
Ayres	Landrum	Shriver
Baring	Leggett	Sisk
Battin	McMillan	Smith, N.Y.
Bolling	McVicker	Smith, Va.
Bray	Mackay	Stafford
Broomfield	Martin, Mass.	Steed
Brown, Calif.	Martin, Nebr.	Stephens
Callaway	Morris	Stratton
Celler	Morrison	Sweeney
Chelf	Morse	Teague, Calif.
Corman	Murray	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Nix	Thomas
Diggs	O'Brien	Thompson, Tex.
Dyal	O'Konski	Toll
Edwards, Ala.	Olsen, Mont.	Tuck
Evans, Colo.	O'Neill, Mass.	Tupper
Fisher	Powell	Walker, Miss.
Flynt	Pucinski	Walker, N. Mex.
Gallagher	Purcell	Watkins
Grabowski	Reinecke	Weltner
Grider	Rhodes, Ariz.	Widnall
Gross	Rivers, Alaska	Wilson, Bob
Hanna	Rogers, Tex.	Wilson, Charles H.
Hansen, Wash.	Roncalio	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, 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. 13161, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 348 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. GOODELL] had 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to move to a different part of the bill, and a different question with reference to the whole problem of setting priorities.

As I indicated in my initial remarks, I believe this is the chief problem with the legislation that we have on the books today. It does not adequately and proportionately set priorities.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I want to make only a modest observation to my friend from New York with reference to what he said at the outset of his remarks. The point he made, if I recall him correctly, was that he suggested that last year when we enacted this legislation the major argument, or the only argument—I do not remember which word he used for it—was the so-called poverty argument.

I would have to disagree with the gentleman. That may have been what he interpreted the bill as being confined to. But at least on this side I think it is fair to say that in addition to being concerned with improving educational opportunities for children in school districts where there are high concentrations of low-income families, with which we are concerned in the one title of the

bill, that this is not a one-title bill, as the gentleman knows, and that it deals with improving the quality of education in the elementary and secondary school levels.

I am sure the gentleman will not quarrel with that.

Mr. GOODELL. I do not quarrel with that, except I want to say that I said the major argument used for this legislation was this need to equalize—the so-called need to equalize the situation, particularly for those poor areas that supposedly cannot support adequate schools. But the gentleman is well aware that the allocation formula we are talking about only applies to title I.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I understand that.

Mr. GOODELL. That is the formula that applies to the title that supposedly is going to help the poor areas.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I understand that.

Mr. GOODELL. And the net effect is to make the rich areas richer, and the poor areas relatively poorer.

But I would say originally when we debated this, we offered suggestions and amendments that would correct this, and we will offer such amendments again this year on the floor, as we offered them in committee.

One of the best ways to handle this would be to allocate the money to the State and let the State, with a State plan, allocate within its own borders.

Given that situation, the problem raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] would be met. He talked about an isolated school district that was located in a rich county. Any State could allocate to the poor school districts, and would, I am sure. So this could be worked out very easily.

I intend to offer, or some one on my side will offer an amendment to permit this kind of flexibility. Let the State allocate to those areas within its borders where it has particular need. And if the State so chooses they can allocate, in New York, to Harlem, to Bedford-Stuyvesant, in Michigan to some of the slum areas of Detroit. They can pick out the priority areas and see that the money is going there, which was the intent of the legislation. I believe this would be a very sensible approach to the whole problem of setting further priorities with the limited amount of money available.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I commend the gentleman and others of his colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor for offering these amendments both in committee and later here on the floor to put the State into this picture in a meaningful way in the distribution of funds under title I. I am sure that would be helpful not only in New York but it would also be helpful in my own State of Minnesota. For example, during the school year 1965–66 under the distribution of State aid within the State of Minnesota, school districts in the congressional district that I represent received 20 percent of the total money allocated under the State aids formula from the Commissioner of Education.

During the same school year under the distribution pursuant to the Federal formula in title I, the school districts in my congressional district only received 3 percent.

The people in the State legislature who are best able to determine the relative needs in the State determined that the districts in my congressional district were seven times more deserving than did the formula planners who distribute the funds under title I. This would be corrected if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and others of his colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor were adopted.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman.

I might point out another aspect of this, any allocation under title I of this bill is made to the school district based upon the number of poor children in the school district, if adequate statistics are available—and if not, then to the county. Of course, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] raised the problem that we do not have statistics in many instances for the school districts of the number of poor children in the school district. So in most instances, apparently, the distribution is made per county throughout the country. This creates special problems where you have a multiple school district situation within a single county. The county, in other words, and the State must work out some plan acceptable to the Commissioner for distributing the money to the school districts within that county. This could be very easily and intelligently handled by putting the States into the picture and giving them the authority to set up State plans that the Commissioner would review to see that priorities are set properly and then let the State distribute the money to the poor areas.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Did I understand the gentleman in the well to say that the plans for the distribution of funds under title I within a county to the respective school districts within that county were submitted to the Federal agency and approved by the Federal agency? Or is it not a fact, I ask the gentleman in the well, that the distribution down to the county level, is covered by this legislation and that below the county level it is covered in the State plan administered by the State governmental agency and is not submitted to or approved by the national agency.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman is only partially correct. I think what I said was that the bill provides for the distribution by the school districts on the basis of the number of poor children in the school districts, if the statistics are available.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. No, that is where the gentleman and I disagree because the bill does not read that way. The bill provides for distribution down to the county level according to the number of children within the categories described. But below the county level, the State exercises its discretion in a rather broad sense to determine how the distribution will be made within the county.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. In every instance where the school districts within the county follow the census tract, of course the distribution within the county is figured from the census data.

Mr. GOODELL. That is to the school district.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, the school districts.

Mr. GOODELL. That is exactly the point on which the gentleman from Michigan and I disagree.

Mr. PERKINS. That is where the census tract and the local school districts are coterminous.

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct.

Mr. PERKINS. But where they are not coterminous within the county, then the State educational agencies make the distribution in accordance with such data as may be available which will best determine those schools which have the largest concentration of educationally deprived children.

Mr. GOODELL. That is in accordance with the criteria furnished by the Commissioner of Education. That is the point I made earlier—subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. Chairman, there will be a variety of other amendments. Let me say, first of all, in this connection that the bill increases the money available for this fiscal year to $1,679 million estimated. The following year, fiscal year 1968, the figure goes to $3,044 million. So the total for these 2 years is $4.7 billion. There will be an effort made to strike the commitment for the second year, particularly with reference to title III. I would point out that title III is perhaps the most controversial title in this bill. It started at $100 million. It went to $105 million. In this bill it goes to $150 million. In 1968 it takes a big jump to $575 million.

In that connection I would like to talk about the section that was debated a little bit earlier. It is the so-called O'Hara amendment to title III. Its language is very clear:

> In approving applications under this title for grants for any fiscal year after June 30, 1967, the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the application of any local educational agency which is making a reasonable tax effort, which is nevertheless unable to meet critical educational needs, including pre-school education for four- and five-year-olds, because some or all of its schools are seriously overcrowded as a result of growth, shifts in enrollment, or otherwise, obsolete, racially-imbalanced or unsafe, or because of any other condition that has imposed a substantial and continuing financial burden upon the agency.

My colleagues, when we first debated this bill, we described title III as the Federal-local schools. We talked about the obvious effort that would be made in the future to expand this title where the

Commissioner of Education can bypass all other educational authorities, go directly to the local level, and set up plans for approval of projects proposed at the local level.

We often are told that these have to be proposed by the local school people. The local school people, as a practical matter, come up with a plan. They submit it, and then you and I know what happens. They talk to the educators. They talk to the people in the Office of Education. And they are told, "Now, if you change it in this way, if you put a little emphasis there, and if you add that program and knock out that program, we might be interested. But we have a lot of applications here. We want to give particular emphasis to this kind of approach."

As a result, they go back and gradually move in the direction indicated by the Office of Education.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Does the gentleman know if any title III applications have been approved or funded by the Office of Education without being first approved by the State Education Agency?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes. I heard the gentleman say on a national television program this morning that none of them had been approved. None of them had been approved by the Office of Education that had not been first approved by the State. That is not true. Three months ago some 6 percent of the approved title III projects had been recommended against by the States involved.

They were approved by the Commissioner. The statement you made this morning was not accurate. I want it on the record. This is a vital matter, that the Commissioner of Education does not have to go to the States, and in 27 or more cases the Commissioner has not taken the recommendation of the States. I think this is a vital example of what we are talking about.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes; incidentally, I enjoyed the program and the performance by both you and our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I did not know if anyone was watching.

I was advised that all the applications they had approved had been approved by the State agency.

Mr. GOODELL. This is the kind of statistic and figure that is often given out. I am sure the gentleman was being accurate according to what he was told by the Office of Education, but I understand that the accurate figure was developed by Mrs. GREEN's subcommittee.

That is my information. We are both going on the basis of information given to us.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I should like to have some of that information, and I should like to correct any misimpression I left, if I did.

Mr. GOODELL. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan would not have misstated deliberately.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman furnish us with the 60 he is talking about which have been approved over State disapproval?

Mr. GOODELL. I can furnish whatever they have in the Green subcommittee.

Mr. MEEDS. Would the gentleman put that in the record?

Mr. GOODELL. This was developed as a specific fact. I believe it was 6 percent of 1,030, or something of that nature.

I simply wish to point out that earlier in the debate a statement was made that one could not pay for busing under the provisions of title II. At least, there was grave doubt raised in this connection.

I am for civil rights and for equal opportunity, but I believe in all honesty I must be opposed to this whole new addition, the O'Hara amendment to title III. Only one aspect is the power to make grants locally to help racially balanced schools. There is a much more important aspect from my viewpoint; that is, that the Commissioner is to be given authority to determine if a locality is making a reasonable tax effort—the Commissioner alone.

The Commissioner is to be given authority to determine what is "overcrowded," to define this; to determine what "obsolete" means, and what "unsafe" is.

In addition, he is to be given authority to make special grants, to give special consideration to school districts "because of any other condition that has imposed a substantial and continuing financial burden upon the agency."

So the Commissioner is to be given a very broad grant of authority here to make a determination if a local school district, under regulations the Commissioner has developed, is qualified at all to apply for title III funds. I believe this is the kind of expansion in title III that we warned of and that we are deeply concerned about in terms of this legislation.

Just for the sake of the record, I would point out that other amendments will be offered. We now have a total of about 15. Most of them will be offered for the record, because we are of the opinion that the Committee has made up its mind, that the mood of the Congress in this respect is clear. We want on the record where we stand on these issues.

There are going to be two or three on which we would hope to have substantial support from both sides of the aisle.

I would urge my colleagues to give them careful consideration when they are presented.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I believe it might be helpful, and even interesting, if the gentleman from New York, who just completed, would let us know which of the 15 amendments are just for the record and which are, in a sense, for real?

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. They are all going to be for real, but there seems to be a disposition on the part of this particular Congress not to go for the State plans.

We will offer this in both title I and title III, but there will be a particular effort, I think, to cut down the authorization for the second year. I think this will be a significant amendment that will have considerable support on his side of the aisle. We would offer an amendment to strike the O'Hara amendment. I know of one from my colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman BELL, to transfer the adult education program to the Office of Education. There are amendments that we will offer, for instance, with reference to the expansion of the impacted program and some other amendments of this nature. They are all, I think, of great significance in redirecting the program.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. But some are more important than others. I get it.

Mr. GOODELL. Some will get more support from your side of the aisle.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would suspect some might. A few will.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. He indicated they will offer amendments from his side of the aisle to cut the authorization of funds in the second year. Since the only increase in funds in the second year that I can discover that would occur in the $400 million in title I, in the case of the amendment which he has already spoken in favor of, I wonder if he intends to cut other funds in order to raise that $400 million.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman should examine the authorizations for the 2 years. Title I goes from $1.3 billion to $2.2 billion. Title II goes from $105 million to $175 million. Title III goes from $150 million to $575 million. Each of the titles with the exception of the impact aid, which is estimated to stay at an increased cost of $35 million for the expansion provided in this bill, is substantially increased. The total is from $1.7 billion in round numbers to $3.44 billion in the second year, fiscal 1968. It will be our effort in some instances to eliminate the second year so that the Congress next year can take a new reading on it and in other instances cut the amount authorized for the second year.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. Almost 19 months ago I rose in this same well and uttered those identical words. At that time we were debating the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, H.R. 2362. Today we are debating amendments to that act in the form of H.R. 13161.

I could, in all honesty, repeat my remarks of 19 months ago and they would be as applicable to this bill as they were to the original act.

Now that we have had experience under the act, I find that what I said in the early months of 1965 can be repeated in the latter months of 1966, with the added emphasis of experience.

Nineteen months ago I addressed myself principally to two major points, upon which I felt the debate resolved. These were:

First, the separation of church and state; and

Second, the utter dependence of the proposed act on local initiative and control.

I think I can discuss these points jointly, for it was the great latitude that was given to local school districts which provided—and still provides—the wall of separation between local control and Federal domination, as well as the wall of separation between church and state.

In March of 1965, I said, relative to the assistance authorized to be given to nonpublic school pupils:

> Services and arrangements provided for nonpublic school students must be special as distinguished from general educational assistance.
>
> The decision about the best arrangement for providing special educational assistance under title I is left to the public education agency of the school district, under the constitution and laws of the State.

And then I proceeded to list some "for instances." These remarks were made, first, on March 24, and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 5, page 5758. The printer had them garbled, so I repeated them the next day, and they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 5, page 5979, for March 25.

The key to both the church-state and the Federal domination issues is found in the fact that "the best arrangement is left to the public education agency."

In other words, every program undertaken under this bill is initiated by the local board of education, or as in the case of title II, the State education agency.

I also justified the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 on the grounds that the legislation did not—as this instant bill does not—spell out programs. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 5, page 5763 is found my remarks made on March 24, wherein I said:

> We have given the local public school agencies every latitude in devising programs to improve educational opportunities for the culturally deprived children. In doing so we recognize and pay tribute to the principle of local control of education. We also realize that the program of greatest urgency in one area may not necessarily be of such urgency in another.

My diligent colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] convened his subcommittee in March of this year and began gathering impressive evidence as to the effective and varied use to which the Federal funds were being put.

In the first place, despite starting programs well after the school year had started, all over the Nation programs had been initiated benefiting more than 7 million children.

As reflected in the committee report, we found that some problems, such as inability to communicate, were shared by most schools serving culturally deprived children. Thus we found a great many local schools focusing major attention to remedial reading, speech, and writing projects.

Variety is indicated in the fact that 40 percent of the schools were using funds to employ subprofessionals as teacher aids, in order to make more efficient use of its available staff of qualified instructional staff.

About 40 percent of the participating school districts have developed inservice training programs for teachers.

As the report points out, we see three different and diverse special programs operated by public schools but made available to nonpublic school students. The examples listed in the report come from areas widely separated geographically, and from areas of differing population density. Each of them is found in the list of "for instances" mentioned by me in March 1965.

As I said from this spot then, and as I say again today, there is no doubt in our minds that the local education agencies are best able to evaluate local problems and to make the decisions as to what programs will best solve their own peculiar problems.

What is good for Trenton, N.J., may be bad for Louisa, Ky., and vice versa. That does not mean that programs for either area are bad. If, for instance, one school board feels it can best meet its problems through greater use of motion pictures and other audiovisual material, and another school board feels that it can best meet its problems by hiring subprofessionals, then both approaches are good. The school board in Litchfield, Minn., has approved a shared-time program; the school board in Cleveland, Ohio, has initiated a remedial reading program, after school hours, in public school facilities, for both private and public school children. All of these programs are funded under this act, and all share the one objective: improving the educational opportunities for the culturally deprived.

That is the genius of this bill. Under it the Federal Government can provide the financial support to improve educational opportunities in every one of the Nation's 3,000-plus counties, with each project tailored to fit a particular need, operated under the provisions of State constitutions and State laws. Washington does not dominate, and the line of separation between church and state is not violated.

I justified the 1965 act on those two main bases. Experience has proved my justification. I can justify this extension and these amendments on the same two bases with equal fervor and, as I have already said, with the added emphasis of experience.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize to my colleagues for citing myself as my personal expert, but it is not often that we have the opportunity to come to the well and say "I told you so," and do so in a positive, affirmative manner.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 339]

Addabbo	Grover	Rivers, Alaska
Albert	Hansen, Wash.	Rogers, Tex.
Anderson, Tenn.	Harvey, Ind.	Roncalio
Aspinall	Hébert	Roudebush
Ayres	Holland	St Germain
Baring	Jacobs	Schisler
Battin	Joelson	Schmidhauser
Bolling	King, N.Y.	Scott
Bray	King, Utah	Shriver
Broomfield	Krebs	Sickles
Brown, Calif.	Kupferman	Sisk
Callaway	Landrum	Smith, N.Y.
Celler	Leggett	Smith, Va.
Chelf	McDowell	Stephens
Cohelan	McMillan	Stratton
Corman	McVicker	Sweeney
Denton	Martin, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Dyal	Martin, Mass.	Thomas
Edwards, Ala.	Martin, Nebr.	Thompson, Tex.
Edwards, Calif.	Moeller	Toll
Ellsworth	Moore	Tuck
Evans, Colo.	Morris	Tupper
Everett	Morrison	Walker, Miss.
Evins, Tenn.	Morton	Walker, N. Mex.
Fisher	Murray	Watkins
Flynt	Nix	Whitener
Foley	O'Brien	Whitten
Gallagher	O'Konski	Widnall
Grabowski	Olsen, Mont.	Williams
Grider	O'Neill, Mass.	Willis
Griffiths	Powell	Wilson, Bob
Gross	Purcell	Wilson, Charles H.
	Reinecke	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, 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. 13161 and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 336 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.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, much of our time this afternoon in the consideration of this bill has been devoted to the allocation formula that is used under title I of this bill. I had some things to say about that, myself, on yesterday in connection with the discussion on the rule. I would like to take this time, however, and address my attention to another section of the bill referred to as title III. I think actually, as the bill came to the floor, this section is referred to as section (C), over on page 57 of the legislation.

I am moved to make these remarks because of the report that has been filed in connection with this bill—the minority report filed by three or four members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, who are not enemies of this legislation, and have announced, I believe, their intention to vote for this bill. Yet in commenting on title III, or section (C), they have this to say:

This bill further expands the authority and power of the U.S. Office of Education, and of the whole Federal bureaucracy, to intervene in State and local educational administration in matters for which that Office has neither very much competence nor any legal responsibility.

They go on in the minority report to say:

It has placed in the hands of the U.S. Commissioner the sole power of determination as to what constitutes educational need and desirable educational practices in thousands of communities.

They go on to say this:

The new authority conferred on the U.S. Commissioner of Education is further broadened. He alone would, as now, determine which applicant school districts are to receive these funds and which purposes are to be favored in their use. * * * He would also be empowered to determine what constitutes obsolescence in facilities, crowding in classrooms (that is, desirable pupil-teacher ratios), and racial imbalance in a school system.

Mr. Chairman, we have recently had in the Committee on Rules, on which I serve, some very interesting hearings in connection with the guidelines that are being administered by the U.S. Office of Education. For me the interesting aspect of those hearings was the revelation that we received as to some of the educational philosophy of Mr. Harold Howe, the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Now, I personally regret very much that in some instances and in some quarters the argument with respect to Mr. Howe has descended to the level of ad hominem, and he has been attacked for lack of educational qualifications, or for lack of intelligence, and his patriotism has been questioned, and other things.

I do none of those things in making my own personal critique of Mr. Howe's philosophy as an educator.

I recognize that Mr. Howe does have very impressive professional qualifications. I certainly make no charge with respect to his patriotism. But I do suggest this. If you will very carefully read the hearings that were held before the Committee on Rules in connection with the guidelines and if you will carefully read some of the speeches that in recent days have been put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and which outline the educational philosophy of the No. 1 man in the Federal Government when it comes to education, you might feel as I do, some alarm and even some dismay at some of the ideas he has expressed.

I want to read very briefly from the speech he delivered before the Founder's Day Convocation, Teachers College, at Columbia University on May 3 this year, entitled "Education's Most Crucial Issue." Here is what he had to say and I am quoting now from his speech:

It is not wholly by chance that our largest cities are marked by predominantly white and predominantly Negro schools and that this separation of the races is on the increase in our cities' schools. And whatever decisions we make about maintaining or eliminating these arrangements, it is necessary also to recognize that segregated schools in the North, every bit as much as in the South, violate not only the most revered principles of this Nation but our fundamental law.

Now what has Mr. Howe said. He has, in effect, declared that de facto segregation, as it exists in Montgomery County—where my own children attend school—that all de facto segregation as it exists in city after city throughout the North, is not only wrong from a policy standpoint, but Mr. Howe has taken it upon himself to say that it violates the fundamental law.

What is the fundamental law of the United States? It is the Constitution.

There is to be sure, pending before one of our courts of appeals, a case which would seek to determine and adjudicate that very question as to whether or not de facto segregation is unconstitutional and is a violation of the 14th amendment or some other portion of the Federal Constitution.

But Mr. Howe has arrogated to himself at this point the authority apparently to determine that de facto segregation is unconstitutional before any court has seen fit to do so. Later on in the speech to which I refer he asks this rhetorical question:

Why isn't it legal and just to have segregated schools as long as they are created by the choices of pupils and parents or by the patterns of residence which emerge in portions of a school district?

He then goes on in this speech and makes it very clear that he does not think it either just or legal even though such racial imbalance or de facto segregation—for the terms can be used in this instance interchangeably—results from the fact that people have chosen to live in a certain area of a city, and even though it is because people have chosen to live in a particular area of the city or county. Mr. Howe says that it is unconstitutional and that so far as he is concerned steps must be taken to eliminate it.

Later on in that very same speech, he makes this statement:

The fact is that although a great deal is being accomplished under the Civil Rights Act, this law is not an ideal instrument for changing de facto school segregation through enforcement.

What does he mean by that? Very simply I think he means this—he concedes that under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 you could not do what he wants to do. In other words you would have difficulty in eliminating de facto segregation that has occurred because of established patterns of residence or because of freedom of choice on the part of people as to where they want to live. Therefore, he is going to turn to other acts of Congress. He is going to turn to various education statutes in order to break up what he regards as undesirable de facto segregation or racial unbalance.

Mr. Chairman, when I questioned Mr. Howe when he appeared before the Committee on Rules, I told him very frankly that I was concerned about the future of the neighborhood schools; the institution of the neighborhood school in American education. He led me to believe that he likewise felt it still had a very important role to play and that the fears I had expressed in this regard were groundless.

So thereafter I consulted another of Mr. Howe's speeches, one that he delivered before the National Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on the 19th of July, a speech which he called "A New Benchmark for Education." If you will bear with me, I would like to quote a passage or two from that speech to illustrate why I have this concern. This is what he says:

I want to emphasize that the educational effectiveness of a mixture of children from different backgrounds does not refer only to racial integration. It also refers to economic and social integration.

He then goes on in another passage of of his speech to refer to the population shifts that have taken place in our country and he says, and again I quote:

It makes it necessary that we take a close look at what the meaning of the word "neighborhood" has come to include. To a disturbing degree it has come to mean the polarization of families according to the size of their split-level homes or the size of their welfare checks. We are faced with the fact that we are becoming a nation of plush suburbs on the one hand, and mid-city slums on the other.

Then he goes on further in the speech, and this is what I would emphasize particularly, to say this:

These are the reasons why we will have to reappraise where the boundary lines of neighborhoods should be drawn when we speak of "the neighborhood school." It is essential that we give youngsters a glimpse of American life as Americans in every strata actually live it. Among other things this means operating our school systems in a fashion that encompasses the rich social, economic and cultural diversity that distinguishes our nation.

Now, I fully concede the right of Mr. Howe to feel as he does, that to have an educationally effective school system you have got to have, in effect, a homogenized society, and you have got to use the school district as some kind of blender to bring in children from every walk of life, from every social strata of our society that you have, to mix them all together in the proper proportion to have an educationally effective system. What I am trying to do by these remarks this afternoon is to alert the American people to what Mr. Howe has in mind. They should be alerted to the fact that under title III of this bill, under the power that he has by virtue of his Office as Commissioner of Education here in Washington, to pass on the grants that are made pursuant to this section, that he may very well, in choosing who the recipients of those grants are going to be, choose those districts that carry

out the particular philosophy that he espouses.

Perhaps that is not a bad thing. Perhaps it is not anything that we should be concerned about. But, you know, when you look at this bill, you find that percentagewise, the biggest quantum increase in funds is under section C of title III. It goes up from $150 million in fiscal 1967 to $575 million in fiscal 1968.

I read somewhere the other day—and I believe my figures are approximately correct—that back in 1956 the activities of the Office of Education were funded only to the extent of around, I believe the figure was, $160 million. Today, 10 years later, that figure has risen from $160 million to about $3.3 billion. So when we talk about the Office of Education, when we talk about the views of Mr. Howe, the Commissioner of Education, we are talking about something that is fundamentally pretty important to the way education develops in this country of ours.

In concluding, I want to read just one other brief quotation from another speech—and I have spent some time reading Mr. Howe's speeches in the past few days—a speech he made in New York City on the 18th of June before the School Administrators Conference, where he said this:

> We are in the midst of a struggle for excellent education for every American youngster. We must use every likely tool we can devise. Local school administrators must consider such means as redrawing school district boundaries and consolidating with neighboring districts for educational purposes, even though political boundaries may remain unchanged. We cannot wait for mayors and city councils to do the work they hired us to do. And sometimes we must do work they don't want us to do.

I would suggest that Mr. Howe is wrong in suggesting that any official in this country can set himself up as some kind of supersalesman for educational policy to the point that he can ignore local educational desires and say, "We are going to make you do something even though you do not want to do it."

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would observe that it seems to me if the gentleman has proved nothing else, he has proved Mr. Howe has made too many speeches. Someone ought to point out to him that the speech he never makes cannot be held against him.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Of course, perhaps that can be said of the speech I have just delivered, but I believe it is useful to point out to the House some of the speeches Mr. Howe has made. For the most part they have been delivered before organizations of professional educators. Perhaps they have been properly advertised in the press, but I have not seen much about them, until the hearings before the Committee on Rules last week brought out some of the statements and some of the comments he has made.

Mr. HAYS. I do not want to have any misunderstanding. I was not disagreeing with the gentleman. Personally, I do not know whether the man is qualified or not. I rather gathered, from some of his speeches, we would be better off if we had another Commissioner of Education. Even so, I believe it would be better if he stayed down there and tended to business, instead of making so many speeches.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his courtesy.

I merely wish to make the point that when we act on this legislation, when we pass on the kind of language which is contained in title III, which says that the Commissioner of Education, in making grants under that section, must—the language is mandatory—must take into consideration plans that exist in school districts which are trying to overcome racial imbalance, that implies something. What does that imply?

There are thousands of school districts throughout the United States in which there is de facto segregation or racial imbalance. Again I refer to the kind of segregation brought about not because of a dual enrollment system, and not because of any law which says a Negro child is compelled to go to this or to that school, but merely because of patterns of residence, merely because people have exercised their freedom of choice to live where they want to live or to send their children to school where they want them to go to school. It is clear to me that Mr. Howe is quite conceivably going to have the authority under this section of the bill to make grants to do away with that kind of situation. He says it will be a voluntary program which must originate with the officials of the local school district. However, he is going to dangle the carrot of the Federal grant before a school board that is financially hard pressed to help them make up their mind to adopt his philosophy for producing an egalitarian, homogenized society.

How is he going to do it? I do not know. Perhaps he is going to set up giant educational parks, where 20,000 students will go to school from all over a metropolitan-wide district. Perhaps he is going to do it by busing students from the suburbs to the inner city. I do not know.

However, it is clear from the record that these are some of the tools that he has in mind to break up the neighborhood school.

It seems to me when an official of the Federal government alleges as Mr. Howe has done, that de facto segregation based on residence, based on freedom of choice, is in violation of the Constitution even before any court of competent jurisdiction has so ruled, that we have gone just a step further than this Congress ever intended to go when it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or when it passed the original Education Act in 1965.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my point of order.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me. I would like to take some credit, if I can, for the amendment to title I which would provide 1 percent of the funds to the communities for programing and planning, or up to $2,000. During the summer months I had a very good intern here from Smith College in Massachusetts who conducted a survey and they determined that they were entitled there to $16,539,000 under title I, but only availed themselves of $11,421,000, or a difference of $5,117,826. As a result of that, we had a survey made with the superintendent of schools and we sent questionnaires out to them asking them questions on why they did not avail themselves of this money under title I. Predominantly the answer that came back was that they had no money for planning and programing. During the summer months the Department of Education requested that survey of me and the answer to the survey was as stated. I understand the original bill as it came up to the committee did not contain this amendment. Is that right?

Mr. BELL. The gentleman is correct. It did not have this amendment. And I think your suggestion very well could have had the effect of bringing this about.

Mr. CONTE. I want to thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, my concern for the continuing improvement of the education of our young people—and, particularly, the young people of Massachusetts' First Congressional District—is of long standing. The deep thought and serious consideration accorded to the Federal programs established under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by every Member of this body were evident in the hours of debate devoted to that measure by the House in the first session of this Congress.

The measure before this body today, in its amendments to the act, is a complex piece of legislation, too, and worthy of equally careful consideration.

We hold an advantage today. We stand with a year's experience at our backs. On the balance, I am encouraged and my enthusiasm is bolstered by what has transpired in that time. We have truly seen the opening of new horizons

in public education. We have seen the realization of heretofore only hoped-for visions of many of our educators. We have seen the awakening of others to the special educational programs that can be employed to the advantage of our underachieving students. We have witnessed communities discover that there were educationally disadvantaged youngsters in their midst and seek answers to the needs of these boys and girls.

Unfortunately, we have also seen instances of hesitation, of faltering, of frustrated attemps to bring home the benefits of the programs of the 1965 act to our disadvantaged and underachieving children at its focus. These instances, when placed in the context of the short-run of the operation of the programs set up under the act, caution us not to be impatient. We have undertaken a comprehensive new program, broad in its scope and predestined to the drawbacks of initial administrative difficulties.

However, it is with equal efficacy that these instances, when placed in the context of the long run of the life of the programs, sound the call to study—to consider—to be aware. Experience is life's best teacher. So, too, it is an astute draftsman of legislative amendments.

I have been a student in the classroom of experience with regard to the operation of title I of the 1965 act. I would like to confine my remarks today, with regard to the amendments to the act, to recounting that experience, the lessons learned, and my support for amendments to title I, called for by those lessons.

Massachusetts was accorded humiliating billing when, in late June of this year, it was announced that, of the 55 States and territories eligible for funds under title I, the Bay State had come in 52d in the percentage of funds allocated to the State for fiscal year 1966, secured for use in the State to improve the educational opportunities of the children covered by that title's provisions.

In terms of dollars, of the $16,539,689 allocated to Massachusetts, the Commonwealth actually received only $11,421,827. This is a difference of $5,117,862. This is a difference made up of money that could have and should have been put to work all over the Commonwealth for special educational programs, facilities, and opportunities—for the benefit of children in our homes in need of such programs.

This difference of more than $5 million can now never be spent for these children. The remedial reading and math programs, the summer schools for mentally retarded children, the individual guidance for educationally disadvantaged youngsters, the cultural opportunity programs—available in some communities—were never made available to children of equal need in other communities. What was the reason?

The First District of Massachusetts was even lower than the State average in the percentage of funds, allocated to its communities, that were successfully applied for and put to work. Whereas the average for all communities in the State was a low 66 percent, western Massachusetts received only 63 percent of its allocated funds. What was the reason? I wanted to know. I wanted to know so that a repetition of such lost opportunities could be precluded in the current fiscal year.

I assure you, as I have assured each of the school superintendents in my district and the officials in the Department of Education of Massachusetts, that my concern is not merely that the money should have been spent—in any willy-nilly fashion—just because the opportunity for expenditure was there. The officials at all levels of administration of this program—local, State, and Federal—are much too conscientious and competent to condone such action or to listen to a foolish advocate of such action.

My concern cannot really be equated to a dollar spent or not spent. It is for the break, or the chance, or the opportunity, for the boy or girl somewhere in Massachusetts in need of that break or chance or opportunity that was not there. My concern was that the money, if it must be put in those terms, had not been vigorously and successfully pursued to fund programs obvious in their need and so planned as to be wise and sound in their undertaking.

The first arguments I encountered were that Massachusetts is a wealthy State, that it could not use the Federal moneys, that the need was not there. These were fallacious arguments. If the wealth was, in fact, there, and the need and use lacking, there would have been no allocation of funds to the State under the provisions of title I in the first place.

The money for title I was allocated because there was a young boy or a young girl in one of the communities in my district, in my State, or in any of the 54 other States and territories, educationally deprived or neglected because of family circumstances. That child was counted and the total count determined the dollars made available to his or her hometown. But, in too many instances in Massachusetts, he or she was counted out before having the chance for the special educational opportunities at the very heart of title I. What was the reason?

To get the answers for my district, I went directly to its educators in its public schools. I wrote a personal letter to each of the 35 school superintendents and enclosed a questionnaire—composed of 17 questions, most of which could be answered by a simple "yes" or "no"—relating to their experiences with title I. The response was enthusiastic and thoughtful. The lessons to be learned from their experiences and their need for additional help in the form of amendments to title I were obviously and persuasively brought home in their answers and comments.

Of the 35 questionnaires sent out, 26 were returned and another superintendent commented in a lengthy letter that touched on the matters raised in the questions. After summarizing their responses, the good and the bad of the first year's implementation of title I came sharply into focus.

The 35 superintendents represented the 73 communities, of the 88 in my district, eligible for funds under title I of the act. Of these 73 communities, 46 were named on application for funds, with only 34 of those applying receiving at least one-half of the amount allocated to it. Thus, of a total allocation to western Massachusetts of $1,159,404, only $732,519.75 were committed to programs for the first fiscal year of the act's operation.

Every superintendent who applied for funds indicated that they felt the programs could and did, where funded, fill a vital need in their communities. The programs that reached the operative stage were unanimously well-received and repeated comments were echoed in letters and notes attached to the questionnaires to the effect that the types of programs that could be funded under title I created new interest in the community with regard to special education programs. Only 3 of the 26 indicated that their local budget was adequate to support the normal educational demands of the community, as well as the supplementary programs now made possible under title I funding.

There were complaints, too. The bureaucratic bugaboos—delay due to guidelines interpretation and reinterpretation, too much paperwork, the need for more funds—were oft-cited, as was the element of time working against the taxed and harassed public educator.

Many of the problems were to be expected and were only temporary during the first months of the implementation of a new program. These are the growing pains of progress. There were a number of the complaints, however, that stemmed from a much more fundamental problem—the complete lack of adequate personnel to plan and write programs and projects of special education.

In replying to the questionnaire, 19 of the 26 superintendents said they did not feel that they had adequate personnel to investigate the possible use of title I funds and to draw up appropriate programs. Many of the superintendents employ teaching principals, already overburdened with both administrative duties and academic chores. Many of the superintendents did, in fact toil over burning midnight oil themselves to plan and write a program to meet the needs of the particular under-achieving children in their school districts.

The repeated entreaty was for a part of the Federal grant funds allocated to the community to be made available for the planning of title I programs to meet the particular needs of that community's children. Only through such means can a school district devote the necessary time and attention to the needs of the children and the development of a program sufficient to meet those needs.

This is the very thrust of title I. It must not be dulled by the impossibility of implementation. The needs of the disadvantaged children must not go unanswered simply because the educational agency does not have the time or the personnel to successfully pursue the money allocated to those very needs.

It makes good commonsense to free a portion of that money to be used for the planning of the programs, projects, and facilities that can, then, be funded under the communities remaining title I allocation. It insures the wisest expenditure of every dollar. This is exactly what the committee has done in one series of its amendments to title I. Within the provisions of these amendments, a grant can be made to a community in the amount of 1 percent of its basic maximum grant, or $2,000, whichever is greater, to be used for planning title I programs, projects, and facilities.

The committee has also made a portion of the funds allocated to each of the State administrative agencies available for the hiring of personnel to assist the local communities with their technical problems in program planning, project writing, and the application procedure. Surely these provisions will go a long way toward insuring a more successful title I program in every State and territory. If the bill had not contained this language, I would have offered an amendment to this effect. Therefore, I commend the committee for taking this action. The needs of Massachusetts, in this instance, were not merely indigenous to the Bay State. However, now that this need has been provided for, it will be imperative for the Bay Staters to apply the broadened grant moneys toward obtaining application approval and funding for programs in this fiscal year.

The youth of the Nation hold the promise of the future in their hands. Today, ours is the responsibility to develop their potential for greatness to the maximum extent within our power. So, in many respects, the promise of the future is held—for a moment—in the provisions of title I of this legislation: in the moment that a mentally retarded child completes a summer session to return to his regular class that fall, with a new confidence in his ability to compete with his fellow classmates; in the moment that the reason for a 7-year-old's lack of achievement is discovered during a summer guidance session; in the moment that a foreign-born child gets a perfect score on his English test during a remedial language class.

Alexander Pope penned the phrase:

'Tis education forms the common mind:
Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined.

I believe I can speak for the educators in the public schools in my district when I say that we do not intend to finish in the cellar of the title I league next June 30.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13161 as I did a year ago in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Mr. Chairman, education has been the hallmark of progress, I believe, in the United States. No other country has equaled the concerned attention that we have given to our educational system. It is not money alone that has preserved our Nation's leadership in this position. It has not been the Federal Government alone that has provided this leadership. Indeed, the very essence of our greatness in this is in the diversity provided by our States. The partnership of the Federal, State, and local governments has been successful in this program because primarily the State and local school boards throughout this country have been effective in providing imaginative and vital leadership in their programs.

We are here today to give further impetus to this program. It has been proven beyond doubt that education is our most effective weapon against poverty. Only by upgrading the educational capacities of the unemployed can we be certain they will have a marketable skill. Only by providing the best education to the very young today can we be assured that they will not be on the relief rolls tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, last week I voted against the amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. I did so because I have never felt that the poverty act in its shotgun approach provides an efficient and effective attack on the problem. I think the record bears this point out. I would point out, however, that Headstart, an educational program farmed out in most States to the educational boards, the local educational boards, has been one of the most successful among all the efforts under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that poverty can best be attacked through education. Mr. Chairman, for this reason, and because of the major role it plays in our economic and political world leadership of the future, I have supported the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1964.

Mr. Chairman, we need only observe the percentage of selective service rejectees in order to get some indication of the educational needs yet unmet.

Mr. Chairman, a New York Times article of October 1 describes the results of mental examinations given to potential selective service inductees.

This article I shall obtain permission to insert into the RECORD at this point when we are again in the House.

The article referred to follows:

FAIL DRAFT TEST—DISQUALIFIED IN MENTAL EXAM—EDUCATION GAP CITED

(By Richard Eder)

WASHINGTON, October 1.—More than two-thirds of all Negroes tested for induction into the armed forces over an 18-month period failed their mental tests, according to a publication of the Office of Education.

This figure, released with considerable reluctance by the Department of Defense, is contained in a survey of United States education performance that will be published in the October issue of American Education.

According to the Defense Department breakdown, which has never before been made public, the rate of failure on the mental tests among Negroes was 67.5 percent. Among non-Negroes, the failure rate was 18.8 percent.

The survey was prepared by Mrs. Caryl Conner, editor of American Education, and Prof. Richard Neufille of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It finds a close correlation between the quality of education available to Negroes—measured by the amount of money spent, the pupil-teacher ratio and other factors—and the gap in performance between Negroes and whites.

The figures are taken from 383,000 tests administered by the armed forces between June 1964, and December, 1965. They include both draftees and enlistees.

According to Mrs. Conner, the armed forces qualification test is perhaps the most extensive survey of United States educational performance in existence.

Thus, in an attempt to rate the comparative quality of education available to Negroes and non-Negroes, the results are of considerable significance.

Mrs. Conner said, however, that there had been considerable difficulty in obtaining a racial breakdown of the test results from the Defense that there was no such breakdown.

It was not until the survey's co-author, Professor Neufille, had obtained the classification number of the file on which the figures were entered that they were made available.

The national failure figure for all races was 25.3 percent. The highest failure rate for all races was 55.3 percent in the District of Columbia. The lowest was in the state of Washington.

Generally, rejection rates were highest in the South, and lowest in the Far and Middle West. In South Carolina, which had the highest failure rate of any state, 85.6 percent of Negroes and 21.8 percent of whites failed.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, the statistics are most disturbing.

They indicate that more than two-thirds of all our out-of-school youngsters tested for induction during an 18-month period failed to meet the minimal requirements for induction. These statistics include both draftees and enlistees.

Mr. Chairman, we face a tremendous challenge merely from the numbers of children demanding entry into our schools.

My own State, the State of California, though perhaps not typical of the Nation, does dramatize this problem.

During the past 8 years the number of children in elementary and secondary schools has grown 50 percent, from 2.9 million to 4.3 million.

Mr. Chairman, even at a predicted slower growth rate over the next 4 years, enrollment in larger education classes will increase by 500,000 students.

Across the country these statistics are echoed.

This fall an estimated 49.9 million children entered elementary and secondary schools. The financial burden is great, as we know.

Mr. Chairman, California is investing nearly -1.8 billion a year, and I know it is faced with great difficulties in meeting this financial burden. Property taxes have skyrocketed.

Mr. Chairman, the same pattern is evident throughout the State. All of our States are under financial pressure to meet the pressing needs of a growing population.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 13161 represents the Federal share in this partnership. Without it, the ground we have gained will be lost and the goals of our battle against poverty would be dashed.

It is indicated that without Federal aid to education, California would be first to raise property taxes some 12 percent in order to maintain its present program.

My California colleagues are cognizant of the public reception such a proposal would receive.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 13161 authorizes the expenditure of $1.6 billion over the next year. It is an investment with promise of rewarding dividends.

We are investing in a great American resource, an educated people.

Mr. Chairman, no longer can our greatness be measured by the number of tons of steel produced and the production of cars in Detroit. Technology has placed great forces within our control. They demand responsible guidance by an informed and educated people.

Mr. Chairman, this is the challenge before us.

I, therefore, urge passage of H.R. 13161.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to mention, in closing, that I will have an amendment to offer at the appropriate time regarding adult basic education.

Briefly, the amendment would transfer administrative authority for the program from OEO to the Office of Education. It is the same amendment that I offered last week during the poverty program debate. It is of a purely administrative nature, and intended to eliminate cumbersome red tape forcing communities to submit their program plans to two agencies at the Federal level. All in effect it means is that instead of the middleman OEO as a funnel for funds, the funds would go direct to the Education Department, and the Education Department right now has farmed out the whole project. So that in effect all that is happening is that the OEO is operating merely as a funnel.

I would point out that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare last week included an identical amendment in its version to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, an attorney from my district has called my attention to a request the local school superintendent has received about a title I education program. The letter, and the request which provoked it, are worthy of the attention of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who has proven himself to be a man of commonsense as well as high intelligence, and who just might be convinced of the need for a little commonsense in the Office of Education and down the line to all who work for him in administering the Federal education program.

My constituent wrote:

Hon. PAUL G. ROGERS,
Member of Congress,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Among the myriad forms to be completed in connection with Federally financed assistance programs available to the several qualified public school districts, one occasionally comes across what can only be regarded as a gem of priceless quality.

Recently, our Superintendent of Public Instruction received a directive wherein he was requested (?) to assist (?) in evaluating (?) certain Title I projects as same relate to "educationally disadvantaged students." The evaluation forms which accompanied this directive were innocuous enough—but—the explanations and directions accompanying the evaluation forms could only have been contrived (?) or composed (?) by a budding genius, if not by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, himself. (See enclosure)

Now, let me hasten to say that no one has a greater appreciation for the flowing beauty and grace of the English language than our Superintendent. No mean linguist himself, he can dangle participles and split infinitives with the very best. His loquaciousness (?) is awesome to behold and, on occasion, his command of socially accepted invective would do credit to the busiest Southern school administrator who has nothing better to do than "afford" "affective reactions (?)" to Federal assistance programs.

Now—don't misunderstand—we thoroughly enjoy spending Federal money. We don't even mind having to hire (at Federal expense, of course) all the addition staff personnel required to fill out all the applications, forms and reports attendant upon obtaining these monies despite the fact that these staff personnel exceed the number of "educationally disadvantaged students" in our schools.

The truth of the matter is that our Superintendent, the etymologist, would like to accommodate the Government in every way if he could just tell what it is the Government wants! But he is worried lest we be severed from the public pap because he might perceive wrong or afford the wrong inferences based on the quantitative and qualitative data focused at this point on a time continuum—or worse yet, that he might assimilate the wrong index with the result that we would all be up the creek without a magnifier.

So—you can see our quandary—we're analyzed if we do and assimilated if we don't—not a very enticing proposition I'll vouchsafe.

In any event, it is a problem we must solve for ourselves assuming, of course, that there are no Federal grants available to us that would assist in interpreting and understanding the intricate workings of the bureaucratic mind. If such monies are available, please send all necessary forms and we'll try again. If not, we will just have to muddle through as before and take our chances.

Since I know something of the heavy demands on your time, this prayer does not require an answer.

The request was as follows:

"AFFECTIVE SUMMARY REACTION"

(To be returned to the Office of Federal-State Relations by October 15, 1966.)

"At this point on a time continuum, quantitative and qualitative data, relative to Title I and Non-Title I schools, have been brought into focus with the opportunity for general analysis, assimilation and inferences afforded. Needless to say, how one feels about that which has been accomplished for educationally disadvantaged students is equally important. This factor, when magnified by the perceptions of a cross section of those who were directly and indirectly involved, becomes perhaps, the singularly most important index as to the effect of Title I. programs on the disadvantaged student. It is to this feeling tone that this form concerns itself. You are requested herewith to afford us your affective reaction."

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in favor of H.R. 13161, the proposed amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. We are only beginning to receive the results of the first year's operations for programs funded under Public Law 89-10, and while the data is incomplete, one point is overwhelmingly clear—those concerned with the education of our children in this country wanted this legislation. They have responded to the offers of Public Law 89-10 with an unprecedented enthusiasm and vigor. It is obvious to me that parents, teachers, researchers, administrators across the land have only been waiting for such an opportunity for growth and change to present itself, for they have answered our challenge with a deluge of ideas and energies to implement their plans.

Now we have the opportunity to make manifest our general approval and appreciation for the success of the program thus far, and to show our good faith for the future. Last year with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we of the Congress attempted to give educators an instrument with which to operate on some of the many problems plaguing American education. We were not absolutely certain how this tool should look since we had never seen or made one before, and because we could not always be sure of precisely what job it would, in fact, have to do. We are now being given a second chance to refine our sometimes crude implement to meet the needs that a year of experience, success, and failure, has shown us. The proposed amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provide the kind of honing that will sharpen our weapon for a new advance on the old enemies, poverty, inadequacy, apathy.

We have been told in some early reports on the progress of title I, for example, that many of the very children for whom these appropriations were made, namely, the economically disadvantaged, have been missed by its programs. In an effort to rectify this error, the amendments lower the number of poor a district must have in order to qualify for title I money, from 100 to 10, and raise from $2,000 to $3,000—beginning in fiscal 1968—the low-income factor. Further, money is made available in these amendments specifically for Indian children, children of migratory workers, and neglected and delinquent children who are wards of the State.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN L. FITZPATRICK, OF CHICOPEE, EARLY PROPONENT OF IMPACTED SCHOOL ASSISTANCE

Mr. Chairman, this legislation also contains some very important and significant amendments to the federally impacted school districts laws, Public Laws 815 and 874. These public laws were first enacted in 1950. The purpose of the two laws is to compensate local educational agencies for financial burdens imposed on them by Federal activities.

One of the early proponents of Federal assistance for federally affected school districts was John L. Fitzpatrick, of Chicopee, Mass., in my congressional district. Mr. Fitzpatrick has been a

distinguished, respected, and leading educator in Massachusetts for more than 40 years, and he served as superintendent of schools in his native city of Chicopee for the past 20 years.

When John Fitzpatrick took over the superintendentship at Chicopee in 1946, World War II had just ended and Westover Air Force Base nearby was returning to peacetime calm with the resumption of military family life. There had been only a few military dependents of school age living at Westover Field during the war. Now military families were being reunited again, new homes were being constructed on the base proper to accommodate these families, and the Chicopee school system began to feel the influx of youngsters who had spent the war years "back home" in other States.

Superintendent Fitzpatrick appealed to his Congressman and Senators, and to the military officers in charge at Westover, to have the Federal Government help bear some of the burden of the cost of educating these military dependents. Joined by other school administrators in other sections of the country who found themselves facing the same problem, Superintendent Fitzpatrick began sketching out a program draft for Federal payments in lieu of taxes to school districts in federally affected areas where the school system had heretofore absorbed the full cost of educating the children of military personnel. This was the genesis of Public Law 815 for school construction, and Public Law 874 for school operation and maintenance payments to school districts in federally affected areas, passed by Congress and enacted in 1950. And John Fitzpatrick played a vital and significant role in the writing of this important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the many friends of John Fitzpatrick in the House and Senate, and in the U.S. Department of Education, will miss his presence before congressional committees in the future, for he retired on August 31. I want to take this opportunity, as we again act on amendments to two public laws which were very close to his heart, to commend and congratulate John Fitzpatrick for his wonderful and lasting contributions to American education. I know that my colleagues join me in wishing Superintendent Fitzpatrick a long, peaceful, and healthy life in retirement. I ask permission to include with my remarks at this point in the RECORD, two editorials taken from Holyoke, Mass., Transcript-Telegram concerning John Fitzpatrick; the first on May 24, 1966, entitled "He Leaves a Worthy Legacy," and the second on August 9, 1966, entitled "With Deep Respect":

[From the Holyoke Daily Transcript, May 24, 1966]

HE LEAVES A WORTHY LEGACY

It was John L. Fitzpatrick Day in Chicopee on Sunday and with every good reason. The man who is retiring after 20 years as Superintendent of Schools in Chicopee has earned each handclap that mounted into an ovation at the testimonial given in his honor. Chicopee has been blessed with his remarkable leadership and it shows in a fine school system with a wide range of educational services.

When John Fitzpatrick came back to his native city to head up the school department, he found special problems added to those common to an industrial community with limited cultural advantages. These centered around the Westover Air Force base and its mushrooming school needs for a high-turnover student body. The new school superintendent attacked all these problems vigorously with enthusiastic determination to give the children in his charge everything a school should give and more.

It is well known and often mentioned how much federal money Mr. Fitzpatrick drew into the Chicopee school system through the need to educate children of the armed forces, but what he did with it is more important. When Westover personnel speak of the good schools in this area, which they often do, they are talking of the Chicopee schools, on and off the base.

A firm believer in guidance, Superintendent Fitzpatrick supported and used this relatively new element in his own school system and throughout the area. He was one of the founders and staunch promoters of the Area Mental Health Center here. He exerted leadership in other groups outside of Chicopee, notably the Massachusetts Superintendent's Association. His work has been observed and imitated in many other school districts.

Superintendent Fitzpatrick has always had a special feeling about Chicopee and what it should receive from its schools. He has been especially interested to see that Chicopee High School graduates get what help they may need to go on to college. He has felt that the public schools should be a fountainhead of cultural enrichment and encouragement.

These idealist principles have been put to work during a period of rapid growth. The Chicopee school population has more than doubled in two decades and 13 new schools have been provided in that time. Superintendent Fitzpatrick leaves a great piece of work for his successor to take over.

[From the Holyoke Daily Transcript, Aug. 9, 1966]

WITH DEEP RESPECT

Another area public official who compiled a distinguished record is retiring at the end of the month. We refer to John L. Fitzpatrick, who has served as superintendent of schools in Chicopee for 20 years. We know of no one in that area of public service who has faced more demanding challenges and who has resolved them with more vision and positive action than Mr. Fitzpatrick.

In the two decades as head of Chicopee's public school system he coped with a dramatic growth of his city's civilian population as well as the deepening of the roots of Westover Air Force Base which had an impact of enormous pressure on the school program.

Schools had to be built. The expanding educational facilities for the residents of Chicopee posed problems to tax the limits of the leadership. But added to that were the services which had to be provided for the children of Westover personnel. The federal government had an obligation here, and Superintendent Fitzpatrick saw to it that Uncle Sam contributed his share to the cost of the growth.

It wasn't easy. Mr. Fitzpatrick didn't always have an understanding School Committee. He had to cope with political maneuvering and jealousies. But he had a goal and he would never let the politicians move him off the main track. True, he had to compromise at times; but every move he made was forward.

John Fitzpatrick is retiring with the respect of his city and of all in the valley who have watched him build a public school system which ranks with the best. He need bow to no one. We bow to him.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], the ranking member on the subcommittee who contributed so much to the enactment of this legislation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13161) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE WILL FOR PEACE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, at the recently completed 55th conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in Teheran the U.S. delegation was privileged to have as its chairman our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

The results of this meeting, which included the election of my friend and colleague from Connecticut, Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, as a member of the executive committee of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and the favorable attitude generally shown to our delegation were due to the tireless and devoted work of Representative PIRNIE.

He followed closely all the details of the sessions and in addition attended the innumerable meetings, conferences, and receptions which are an integral part of such meetings.

All the members of the U.S. delegation are personally grateful to Representative PIRNIE for his solicitude for their welfare, for his leadership, and for the beneficial results of the Conference to the national image of the United States.

Not the least of Representative PIRNIE's contributions was his notable speech, "The Will for Peace," which he gave at the opening of general debate and which placed the inevitable discussion of Vietnam on a high level. So noteworthy were Mr. PIRNIE's remarks, and so well did they state the position of the United States in the Vietnamese struggle, that I am happy to include them here in the

RECORD for the information and enlightenment of my fellow Members and the general public:

THE WILL FOR PEACE

(An address by the Honorable ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Member of Congress, chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Interparliamentary Union, 55th Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Teheran, Iran, September 27–October 4, 1966)

As Chairman of the American delegation to the 55th Interparliamentary Conference I have the honor to express appreciation to our Iranian hosts and all others who have made this gathering possible. As long as Parliaments continue to meet there is hope that we can meet the challenges of mankind.

The American delegation was greatly impressed by the call made in this chamber by His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran this very morning. He urged this conference, as did our distinguished Chairman, to conduct this meeting in a climate of understanding reason and good-will. I can assure this assembly that such is the aim of the American delegation.

Some of the speakers this morning referred to an issue which weighs heavily on the hearts of all of us.

Let there be no misunderstanding. The United States is second to none in wanting peace in Viet Nam. Indeed, there is probably no parallel in recent history to the pressure for peace which my Government, with the welcome advice and assistance of many other countries and leaders, has exerted over the past year. We believe devoutly that there is no more urgent task confronting the statesmen of the world than finding a way to terminate the fighting in Viet Nam.

Our record in seeking an honorable solution speaks for itself. We have repeatedly offered to go anywhere, at any time, meet with anyone, and discuss any proposals if doing so would advance the cause of peace in Viet Nam. We have said we will engage in unconditional discussions or in negotiations on the basis of the Geneva Accords. In the some twenty-five efforts which have been made over the past three years to settle the conflict, the United States has consistently been cooperative. We have made many efforts of our own to get the problem to the conference table, both directly with Hanoi and through third parties. And we have responded affirmatively to the efforts of others, including the Afro-Asian 17-nation appeal last year and subsequent appeals by individual leaders.

The U.S. maintains literally a 24-hour a day watch on possibilities for peace in Viet Nam. We have not and will not fail to exploit any opening that may offer hope of leading to a solution of the problem. It was for these reasons that the United States enthusiastically supported the resolution approved by the IPU Council at Canberra on April 16 which is before this distinguished group for consideration in Tehran. It demonstrates that our attitude is consistent with the views and aspirations of this group and of most nations in the world.

The problem, however, is that it takes at least two parties to negotiate, and thus far the response of the other side to all efforts to bring peace to Viet Nam has been a harsh and unyielding negative. We cannot help but ask, what selfish reason leads North Viet Nam to persist in its refusal to talk. Is it pressure from Communist China? Is it a conviction that time is on its side, is it a hope that force will prevail, or is it a delusion that the United States is a "paper tiger"?

Hanoi's uncompromising attitude in the face of a world-wide desire for negotiations is startling. The report of our Secretary General on this point reads as follows:

"On the American side, there was a temporary suspension of the US air raids on North Vietnam at the beginning of 1966, and this coincided with a peace offensive. High officials were sent to different capitals to confirm that the United States was disposed at any time to enter into negotiations without conditions, either at Geneva or elsewhere, a position which has been reaffirmed at various times since then.

"These overtures, however, met with no response in Hanoi, where they were denounced as frauds. . . .

"In its refusal to enter into negotiations, the Hanoi Government is fully supported by Peking, which encourages North Vietnam in its resistance."

In this connection I am reminded of the old proverb "You can't clap with one hand."

North Viet Nam has persistently refused to engage in unconditional talks and has established pre-conditions for negotiations which in effect would mean turning the country over to Communist rule. The United States is absolutely confident that this is not the fate which the people of South Viet Nam seek for themselves. The recent elections there offer the best proof. Despite an intensive nation-wide Viet Cong campaign of propaganda and terror to keep the people from the polls, some eighty percent of the registered voters, or more than four million people, cast ballots for the parties of their choice. This repudiation of the Viet Cong came as no surprise because nearly a million Vietnamese had already voted with their feet by fleeing from Communist oppression in the North to South Viet Nam.

How long Hanoi will go in seeking to impose rule by a small minority on the clear will of the majority remains to be seen. But let me say emphatically today—that as long as that happens, the United States will be there helping the gallant people of South Viet Nam to protect their right of self-determination.

If World War II taught us anything, it was this: aggression appeased is aggression unleashed. We learned from the terrible tragedy of Munich that we must not, cannot, and will not permit a small nation struggling for its freedom to fall into the arms of a more powerful and aggressive neighbor.

We have given our solemn word to stay in Viet Nam until aggression ceases. And we will keep it. Those who interpret the right of free speech and dissent in my own country as a sign that America will abandon its pledge do not know my country well.

Let there be no mistake about it. Aggression is being waged against the Republic of Viet Nam. According to our best evidence, there are now no fewer than nineteen regiments of North Vietnamese regular Army troops in South Viet Nam. We as parliamentarians should be particularly mindful of what our colleagues who are closest to Viet Nam have to say about the problem. At its session in Seoul earlier this month the Asian Parliamentary Union agreed that

"External aggression by Communist forces seriously endangers the freedom and independence of the Vietnamese people and peace in the entire region. The Assembly commended the historic and timely decision of the Republic of Korea, Australia, Philippines, Thailand and other Asian Pacific countries to dispatch troops or to extend various types of assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam, and noted that to defeat aggression, aid to Viet Nam must be continued."

These, then, are the facts of the situation and the views of many of the free nations of Asia. This morning the delegate of the Soviet Union has again accused falsely the United States of committing aggression in Viet Nam.

I cannot let this distorted version of history go unchallenged. We seek no gains for ourselves in Viet Nam: no territory, no bases, no alliance. Nor do we seek the destruction of North Viet Nam or its government. Each and every one of our military operations in Viet Nam has been taken merely in response to steadily intensified military operations from the North and is designed for one purpose only: to halt the aggression. When that aggression stops, United States forces will gladly return home and American military bases there will be dismantled. We are prepared to sit down tomorrow to negotiate the terms of American withdrawal if the other side is prepared in good faith to abandon its efforts to subvert South Viet Nam.

Instead of circulating propaganda documents and indulging in harsh statements, the Soviet Union should contribute to ending the tragic conflict in Southeast Asia. It can do so by exercising its responsibility as Co-Chairman of the Geneva Conference to convene an international conference on Vietnam which it has failed to do. It can do so by joining in efforts to bring peace through United Nations action, which it has so far rejected. And, quite fundamentally it can do so by prevailing on its friends at Hanoi to leave their neighbors alone. We have a saying in the United States that it is not words but deeds that count. So I ask the Soviet representative, when his country will stop complaining and begin to take the steps within its power to bring peace about. It should join with the rest of our members in supporting the resolution adopted by the IPU Council at the Canberra session which calls for immediate discussion.

Limitations of time, Mr. President, make it impossible to do full justice to a problem of this gravity. I would conclude by reemphasizing that we can have peace in Vietnam tomorrow if Hanoi really wants it.

The United States wants peace with honor in Viet Nam with all its heart. We will not grow weary in the search for a just settlement; but neither will we relent in our determination to do what is necessary to protect South Viet Nam and to help maintain stability in Asia until those bent on conquest abandon their aggression.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, today, October 5, I have asked President Johnson to consider a third suspension of bombing of North Vietnam.

With the forthcoming summit meeting scheduled in Manila on or around October 28, when President Johnson together with six of our Asian and Pacific allies in the Vietnam war will confer on the ways and means of bringing about a peaceful solution of the war in Vietnam, the cessation of bombing, at least during the proposed meeting, might provide the most impressive proof of our sincerity.

Chief U.S. Delegate Arthur J. Goldberg in his address before the United Nations made certain new offers in the direction of seeking a peaceful solution.

Ambassador Goldberg said among other things:

My government remains determined to exercise every restraint to limit the war and to

exert every effort to bring the conflict to the earliest possible end.

He restated:

The aims of our government in Vietnam are strictly limited. We are not engaged in a "holy war" against Communism. We do not seek to establish an American empire or a "sphere of influence" in Asia.

We seek no permanent military bases, no permanent establishment of troops, no permanent alliances, no permanent American "presence" of any kind in South Vietnam. We do not seek to impose a policy of alignment on South Vietnam.

We do not seek the overthrow of the Government of North Vietnam. We do not seek to do any injury to mainland China nor to threaten any of its legitimate interest.

We do not ask of North Vietnam an unconditional surrender of anything that belongs to it; nor do we seek to exclude any segment of the South Vietnamese people from peaceful participation in their country's future.

He went on to say:

We want a political solution, not a military solution to this conflict.

Further he said:

The United States is willing to take the first step. We are prepared to order a cessation of all bombing of North Vietnam—the moment we are assured, privately or otherwise, that this step will be answered promptly by a corresponding and appropriate de-escalation on the other side.

Our Government, under the leadership of President Johnson, has carried on an unremitting effort to negotiate a peaceful solution to the problem without abandoning the people of South Vietnam, and after the recent trip to Vietnam with 13 other Members of the House I returned with the conviction that our Government's policy is the right one.

Further, I am aware that on two different occasions we suspended bombing, once for 37 days and once for 6 days, and I know full well that these actions failed to elicit a corresponding response from the other side. Not once since 1954 have the Communists taken a single backward, or conciliatory, step but they have, on the contrary, pressed forward their campaign of terrorism, sabotage, and aggression without any pause.

Nevertheless, I would urge the President to consider a further suspension of bombing, perhaps for an announced period of 10 days or 2 weeks, and as great a curtailment of ground action as military necessity will permit for the same period prior to and including the time of the meeting in Manila.

There are, of course, risks involved in such a course which the Commander in Chief is better able to judge than am I, but I feel it to be imperative that we repeatedly and unmistakably demonstrate to both friend and foe our earnest desire for the processes of peace, and our determination to spare so far as humanly possible the people of Vietnam, and our own troops, any unnecessary bloodshed and suffering.

As a Nation we must show the same resolute courage in seeking peace, as is shown by our men in the fields and skies of Vietnam, and as is daily demonstrated by the citizens of that unhappy land.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, certainly there cannot be a Member who is not aware of the Washington area's Visitors Convention Bureau, what with the public service advertising they have been stressing during the last several months. One of the feathers in the Convention Bureau's cap certainly is the convention that is convening today at the Statler-Hilton Hotel. This is a convention of the National Employment Association, an organization with which I am certain many of the Members are not familiar.

It is a group made up of affiliated State employment agency associations and of individual agencies in States where there are no State associations.

I bring this to the House's attention, Mr. Speaker, because for the last 8 years I have worked very closely with one of the affiliate members and I want to publicly express my appreciation for the service they have been providing to the State of California.

As a certified public accountant who knows full well how difficult it has been to upgrade the professional standing of accountants, I have been pleased to see the great efforts that have been made by the California Employment Agency Association in what was once a rather questionable industry with its unethical practices, and of its upgrading through personnel placement training and the higher caliber of services rendered to all employers.

It may come as a bit of a surprise, but there are many instances in California where not only private but public employees have been recruited through some of the excellent agencies which, in turn, are affiliated with the California Employment Agency Association.

During my career in public life, it has been my privilege to work closely with a number of the leaders and original founders of this organization; such persons as J. R. Pierce, the association's founding father, and Jean Kerr, its current president, as well as my very close and personal friend and fellow Whittierite, Jean Widdicombe, who owns the Dial Agency in Whittier.

During this close association with these leading lights of the California group, I have had the privilege of counseling them on the history of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and on how, over the past 50 years, the institute has managed to instill public confidence in financial reports that are signed by their affiliate members. I am pleased to state, Mr. Speaker, that the same quality of integrity in the services rendered by certified public accountants now is evident among the affiliated members of the California Employment Agency Association.

I am certain that the leaders of this group will, during this convention, give wise guidance and counsel to the National Employment Association; guidance and counsel which will lead to the creation of this same degree of public confidence in all of its affiliated members.

THE HOUSE MUST ASSUME A STRONGER ROLE IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, how often have we heard in recent years the statement: "The House of Representatives has no effective voice in the foreign policy decisions of the United States." Writers and commentators say again and again that in this complex world of the 1960's, where international politics is crisis politics, where the need to act is surpassed only by the need to act quickly, where efficient organization and refined information are the fiber and sinew of international politics, the supreme role in foreign policy belongs to and is the exclusive responsibility of the Chief Executive.

The less fervent detractors of the House's role in foreign policy maintain that the exercise of foreign policy is shared between the President and the Senate. Advocates of this theory maintain that since the Constitution gives to the Senate an intimate form of power in foreign affairs, namely the authority to accept or reject treaties entered into by the President, and the power to confirm or deny his diplomatic appointments, it is evident that no real role was ever envisioned for the House.

Other critics argue that because of its disparate composition, the rapid turnover in membership, its limited time for debate and discussion, the House of Representatives is inherently unsuited and, therefore, wisely excluded, from any determinative role in foreign policy. The whole case against participation of the House in the foreign policy decisions of this country is summed up in a statement by William S. White in his book "Home Place," the story of the House of Representatives.

To ask of the House the kind of foreign policy debate, or grand constitutional inquest, which can be heard in the Senate at its best, is like asking an able and elderly banker or farmer, a man deeply and perfectly at home with the realities of banking and farming to turn his efforts to imaginative, creative discussion of, say, the doctrine of transsubstantiation. When the House is thrust into the great, swampy field of world affairs the result is never a happy one.

Today, speaking to you on the floor of this great Chamber, I want to challenge all those—the scholars, the newsmen, and even my own colleagues—who, either by intention or by habit, have lent their prestige and support to the solemn fiction that the House of Representatives has no role in the foreign policy decisions of this Nation. I challenge these critics on the grounds that their indictments

are constitutionally invalid, historically untrue, and in practice unrealistic.

Even the most cursory look at the Constitution casts grave doubts on the presumption so prevalent today that foreign affairs is solely the province of the President or the President and the Senate. Article II of the Constitution defines the foreign policy powers granted the President. Section 2 declares:

> The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

The same section grants him the power to make treaties and to appoint ambassadors, consuls, and other public ministers. But this authority is clearly circumscribed by the stipulation that he can act in these areas only with "the advice and consent" of the Senate and with the concurrence of two-thirds of its membership. Finally, section 3 gives the President the power to receive diplomatic representatives.

It was no accident that the Constitution was written with these restraints on the President, for the framers of the Constitution were well aware that traditionally the control of foreign relations was regarded as a function of the executive branch. But two developments in American history prior to 1787, influenced the framers to modify the historic tradition of executive predominance in foreign policy matters. The first development was the persistent distrust of executive power rooted in bitter colonial experience with the English King and royal Governors. The second development stemmed from a decade of legislative control over foreign affairs, first under the Continental Congress and later by the representative branch set up by the Articles of Confederation.

The Continental Congress, so suspicious of any sort of executive power, conducted all foreign relations under the auspices of the Committee of Secret Correspondence and later the Committee on Foreign Affairs. From time to time the Continental Congress as a whole dabbled in the management of foreign affairs.

Under the Articles of Confederation foreign policy matters were somewhat better coordinated. Although a Department of Foreign Affairs was created, the Confederation Congress retained all the foreign affairs powers, held a tight rein on the Department's two Secretaries—John Jay and Robert Livingston—and even managed to get along without a Secretary for 18 months.

When the Constitutional Convention convened in Philadelphia in 1787, a tradition for legislative control of foreign affairs was firmly established and the distrust of executive power was still widespread. The control of the treaty-making power was of particular concern to the Convention. In the first draft of the Constitution, the function of making treaties and appointing ambassadors was assigned to the Senate on the rationale that this body represented all the States equally. However, after the method for electing the President had been agreed upon, the Congress decided to give the President primary power in these two areas, subject to approval by the Senate.

The Framers then assigned the other key foreign policy powers of their day—the power to regulate foreign commerce and to declare war—to the Congress as a whole. Holbert Carroll in his book "The House of Representatives in Foreign Affairs" concludes:

> This action, coupled with the decision to associate the Senate and the President in treaty-making and appointments, leads to the conclusion that the Framers assumed that Congress . . . would predominate in the control of foreign affairs.

To this conclusion based on history the advocates of Presidential supremacy will doubtless reply, "But times have changed. This is the 1960's not the 1780's." In many respects this should be a valid reply, for times have changed. Foreign policy is no longer limited to matters of treatymaking or the conduct of war. But the Constitution provides for congressional participation in foreign policy in the 20th century by its grants of power under article I, section 8. In addition to the power to regulate commerce and declare war, the Congress—both the House and the Senate—is given the power to levy taxes, coin money and regulate its value, raise and support armies, provide for a navy, define and punish offenses against the law of nations, and make rules for capture on land and water. Two truths are obvious: Congress possesses certain constitutionally stipulated powers for influencing foreign policy and American foreign policy today rests squarely on the kinds of powers which constitutional doctrines stipulate for Congress. American foreign policy today depends on government loans and expenditures which require congressional appropriations; American foreign policy depends on military aid, trade agreements, resources control which require enabling legislation from the Congress; American foreign policy depends on the existence of military forces in constant readiness—this too must have congressional legislation and appropriations; American foreign policy lives with the imminent possibility of war—a possibility which requires a Congress ready to accept the responsibility of war and a nation willing to accept the sacrifice of war.

The conduct of foreign policy now calls for joint legislative-executive cooperation in the determination of objectives and in the formulation and execution of policies. The Executive must necessarily retain the initiative, but foreign policy is not for his sole determination or an exclusive relationship between the President and the Senate, but it includes the House as well. The Constitution by its grants of power clearly authorizes and requires this joint role.

Examining the role of the House of Representatives in foreign policy in the light of history reveals a long record of direct involvement in foreign affairs. During the first decade of the Republic, 1789–1800, the House acted upon several matters affecting the foreign relations of the United States. Acting in conjunction with the Senate, the House established a Department of Foreign Affairs—later to be known as the State Department—authorized money to support our embassies abroad and established the Post Office with the stipulation that the Postmaster General was to make agreements with foreign postmasters for the reciprocal receipt and delivery of mail.

It was also during this early 10-year period that Congress used its commerce power as a lever in foreign relations. In June 1794 Congress passed the first Neutrality Act, thereby supporting Washington's famous neutrality proclamation of April 22, 1793. Later by joint resolution Congress placed a temporary embargo on all ships in American ports bound for foreign ports and authorized the President to lay an embargo pending the next session.

Having tested the mettle of her commerce powers to affect foreign policy, the House proceeded to raise the question of her constitutional duty to enact legislation or appropriate funds to give effect to a treaty made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. This issue was debated at length in the House when an appropriation was sought to implement the Jay Treaty with Great Britain. The appropriation was finally voted over strong opposition but at the same time the House adopted a resolution offered by James Madison to the effect that: "When a treaty stipulates regulations on any of the subjects submitted by the Constitution to Congress, it must depend for its execution, as to such stipulations, on a law or laws, to be passed by Congress. And it is the constitutional right and duty of the House of Representatives in all such cases, to deliberate on the expediency or inexpediency of carrying such treaty into effect, and to determine and act thereon, as, in their judgment, may be conducive to the public good." This position has been vindicated by the Supreme Court in a number of cases holding that a later act of Congress supersedes a treaty as domestic law. *Al Abra Silver Mining Company* v. *United States*, 175 U.S. 423, 460 (1899). Thus by the end of the 18th century it was clearly established that the House, via its powers in commerce and its power of the purse, had a role in the foreign affairs of the young Republic.

During the 19th century the House of Representatives was principally occupied with the domestic affairs of a growing young nation, but she did continue to play a significant role in foreign affairs. Congressional control over international matters, especially by the House, was evident in the occurrences leading up to the War of 1812. Before the outbreak of war, Congress, led by Henry Clay and his warhawks, used the foreign commerce power to acerbate relations with Britain and France by various embargo acts. The War of 1812 was, indeed, a congressional war.

A few years later the House took the lead in prodding the President to recognize the insurgent republics in Latin America. In 1818, Henry Clay proposed to appropriate funds to pay the salary for a minister to one of the new republics, even though the President had asked for no money. The proposal was defeated, but on February 10, 1821, the

House passed a resolution giving "its constitutional support" to the President whenever he should consider it expedient to recognize the new states. It was obvious that the House had carried its point when the President requested and received $100,000 for diplomatic missions to Latin America.

Further questions regarding the powers of Congress in the recognition of new states and regarding the role of the House in foreign affairs were raised in response to the Texas declaration of independence in 1836.

Manifest destiny had gripped the public imagination and Texas became the goal. In July 1836, the House and Senate approved resolutions favoring the recognition, although President Jackson reasserted Executive power in the recognition of new States. But Jackson gave way as Monroe had done 14 years earlier. He extended recognition to Texas soon after Congress appropriated funds for the salary of a diplomatic agent to the new republic. Domestic politics complicated the question of annexation for the next 9 years: some opponents feared a war with Mexico, while others feared the extension of slavery. Although the Senate rejected an annexation treaty sent up by President Tyler in April 1844, within 6 months Texas was annexed by joint resolution of both Houses. The same method was employed in 1898 when Hawaii was annexed.

Other examples of "congressional fishing in disturbed international waters" can be recalled. After having failed to sanction the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, the House, provoked by the excursion of Napoleon III in Mexico, unanimously resolved "that it does not accord with policy of the United States, to acknowledge a monarchical government, erected on the ruins of a republican government in America under the auspices of any European power." When Secretary of State Seward tried to brush aside the resolution on the grounds that this was just the opinion of one part of Congress respecting a matter legally within the province of the President, the House was indignant. They responded with a resolution adopted by an overwhelming vote that "Congress has a constitutional right to an authoritative voice in declaring and prescribing the foreign policy of the United States."

This tempest subsided until 1896 when a concurrent resolution expressing the view that a state of belligerency should be recognized in Cuba, was ignored by President Cleveland. In April 1898 amid great clamor on the House floor a more vigorous resolution declaring that the "people of Cuba are and of right ought to be free and independent," and directing the President to use force to secure the withdrawal of Spain from Cuba was passed. A bellicose Congress had prodded the United States into another war. Congress continued to dominate U.S. foreign policy with Cuba by the insertion of the Platt amendment, which stipulated conditions for recognition, in the form of a rider to the Army appropriations bill of 1901.

Despite its intermittent and sporadic participation in foreign affairs during the 19th century, the House did exercise a decisive influence upon our foreign policy—in the War of 1812, the annexation of Texas, and the intervention in Cuba.

The role of the House of Representatives in foreign affairs has grown remarkably, if not steadily, during the 20th century. Until the end of World War I the House played a bit part on a foreign policy stage dominated by the President. The House approved the Underwood Tariff, voted for war with Germany, and acquiesced to a presidential veto over a joint peace resolution passed in lieu of the Versailles Treaty. In the 1920's the House supported legislation for U.S. adherence to the World Court, although such action was delayed until 1945. It was not until a decade before Pearl Harbor that the House began to exert a more persistent and pervasive control over the foreign policies of the United States. This reawakening was spurred by a series of world events—widespread economic depression, the rise of Mussolini and Hitler, the crisis in Manchuria, the Italo-Ethiopian episode, civil war in Spain, war in China and in Europe.

When Congress adopted the Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930, such legislation was regarded as wholly domestic in its implications. But a sharp drop in world trade shortly thereafter forced Congress to reconsider American tariff policy in terms of its impact upon the rest of the world. The result was the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 which delegated authority to the President to make reciprocal agreements for the reduction of tariffs within limits laid down by Congress. This legislation laid the foundation for congressional participation in complex foreign economic policy problems of the postwar years.

While the House made strides in the area of foreign economic policy, retreat and isolation prevailed in the political field. Discussion and passage of neutrality legislation dominated House debate from 1922 to 1939. Between 1935 and 1939, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs was flooded with bills and resolutions seeking to preserve traditional isolation. The upshot was a series of five neutrality laws, but it was a futile task for by 1941 America was at war.

Involvement in a world war caused Congress to make an about-face: pleas for isolation were drowned in the rhetoric which gave rise to the Lend-Lease Act of 1941, the creation of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in 1943, adoption of the Fulbright and Connolly resolutions which indicated congressional support for the postwar establishment of an international organization to keep the peace, congressional participation in international conferences at Dumbarton Oaks, Mexico City, and San Francisco. By 1945 the House had already participated so extensively in legislation preparing for the postwar world that she felt it only natural to continue her role after hostilities terminated. By a vote of 288 to 88, the House passed a resolution amending the Constitution by giving itself equal power with the Senate over treaties. Unwilling to share this power, the Senate took no notice and, once ignored, the resolution withered.

The Second World War served to mature Congress, and especially the House in its foreign policy role. The war had caused a radical expansion in the scope, variety, and costs of the global concerns of the United States. Everything was changed—problems which were once considered wholly domestic in implication were now seen as inextricably linked to international concerns. Evidence of this transformation abounds. In 1925 not more than 1 of every 25 bills before Congress touched on foreign policy; today 1 out of every 5 bills has some foreign policy implications. In the 73d Congress the House Committee on Foreign Affairs authorized the appropriation of less than $200,000 for foreign policy matters. In the 82d Congress, it authorized $14 billion for foreign aid and mutual security: an increase of 70,000-fold.

The House's increasing importance on the international scene in recent years has been demonstrated by the submission to Congress of international agreements which require legislative implementation. The hallmarks of this legislation are U.S. participation in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank, membership in the Food and Agricultural Organization, the World Health Organization and implementation of the NATO Treaty beginning with the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949.

The development of foreign aid as a tool in the execution of foreign policy has forged a vital role for House committees affecting foreign policy. Beginning with the Marshall plan of 1948, the Herter committee, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs played a significant role in hammering out the details of the administration and execution of economic assistance. The surge of foreign aid legislation called into play the massive appropriation machinery of the House Appropriations Committee and has given it tremendous influence in the conduct of postwar economic policy. The existence of the authorization function of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the appropriation function of the Appropriations Committee gives the House a reinforced opportunity to review how money has been spent and how programs have functioned.

Another significant development has transpired since World War II to enhance the role of the House in foreign policy without a formal constitutional change. Formal treaties which require approval of the Senate have given way to agreements between our President and foreign nations—agreements negotiated in a framework provided by Congress and governed by conditions spelled out in advance by Congress. Furthermore, this shift from treaties to legislative programs automatically transferred to the House a large share of the legislative responsibility for American foreign policy once held exclusively by the Senate.

In the last 5 years this House has enacted several major resolutions which

have put the House on record on major policy matters. House Concurrent Resolution 570, concurred in on October 10, 1962, expressed the sense of the Congress that the continued exercise of United States, British, and French rights in Berlin was a fundamental political and moral determination and that the United States would use whatever means necessary to prevent any violation of those rights. This resolution, authored by the Honorable Mr. ZABLOCKI, passed the House by unanimous vote, clearly embodying the fervent desire of all Americans to see West Berlin remain free.

Legislation affirming support of the President following the Gulf of Tonkin incidents in August 1964 originated in the House of Representatives as Senate Joint Resolution 1145 and it was also this body, through the Emergency Food Aid for India Act of 1966, which supported the President's initiative in helping India combat the specter of hunger.

A quick look at the statistical record of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs alone will indicate the depth of this congressional concern with foreign affairs. During the 1st session of the 89th Congress the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, out of 608 pieces of legislation, guided 16 foreign policy measures into law and adopted 7 foreign policy resolutions. The committee conducted 335 hearings with over 310 witnesses testifying. Out of 302 hours and 44 minutes of sessions, the committee and an able staff produced 3,087 pages of printed hearings and 961 pages in 64 reports. Members of the House in the 89th Congress have a vast and growing experience in foreign affairs. Virtually every bill they discuss from sugar legislation, to monetary controls, to disarmament legislation touches on some foreign policy issue. Participation in international conferences such as the Interparliamentary Union and the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, plus official study trips to view first hand such trouble spots as the Dominican Republic and Vietnam have given all Members a more intimate involvement with foreign policy. It is just such study missions which have resulted again and again in the pruning of administration requests for the mutual security program, outlined better guidelines for foreign aid and brought increased knowledge of foreign affairs to the House.

I would be remiss in my attempt to scan the history of the House of Representatives in foreign affairs if I did not remind you that many of this country's distinguished spokesmen in foreign affairs served their "international apprenticeship" in this body. John Quincy Adams, who was President as well as Secretary of State, chaired the House Committee on Foreign Affairs as did John Jay, first appointed Secretary of Foreign Affairs under the Continental Congress. John Marshall, a Secretary of State, was a Member of this House, as were James Madison, Henry Clay, Edward Livingston, John Forsyth, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, James Buchanan, Edward Everett, Hamilton Fish, James G. Blaine, John Sherman, William Jennings Bryan, Cordell Hull, James Byrnes, and Christian Herter. Many distinguished members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee began their careers in this Chamber, speaking to foreign policy issues as I do today—among them are Mr. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, Mr. MANSFIELD, of Montana, Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and Mr. SMATHERS, of Florida. At the present time two former Ambassadors are Members of the House: OGDEN REID, former Ambassador to Israel, JONATHAN BINGHAM, a former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Chester Bowles, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee from 1959 to 1961, was a former Ambassador to India.

The tradition of the House in foreign affairs is replete with distinguished names and rich in significant legislation. In this review of the constitutional basis for the participation and by this rather kaleidoscopic survey of the last 200 years, it is not my intention to assert that the Congress should be supreme in the foreign policy sphere. Nor am I advocating any position so rash as a congressional power to negotiate treaties or to assume any of those powers specifically delegated to the Chief Executive. Historically, the initiative in foreign affairs has rested with the President, for reasons of superior access to information and the Executive's ability to respond swiftly. In the main, I think that this is as it should be.

But I do argue, with the force of all my convictions, that there is an urgent and vital role for the House of Representatives in the conduct of foreign policy today. I am weary of the allegations that this House is ill-suited for foreign policy considerations, that this House is too provincial to grasp the subtle intricacies of international politics, that our committee system is too clumsy and overlapping to conduct meaningful investigations, that our debate is too limited to explore the philosophy of our foreign alliances. I have grown weary of our being likened to Shakespeare's Hamlet, tormented by dreams of grandeur, but whose defects conspired with inopportune circumstances to undermine him.

I assert that the House has the role, via its vast constitutional powers, to review, modify, and implement executive actions in the conduct of foreign affairs. This role is, indeed, the very essence of the American constitutional system of checks and balances. Representing local interests as it does, the House furnishes a sort of recurrent plebiscite on the foreign policy of the United States. It is Congress, not the Executive, which most immediately reflects popular feeling, in foreign and domestic matters. Can anyone question the proposition that the November elections may have great influence on our foreign policy. In a dozen key races across the country the decisions of the voters may well turn on which foreign policy proposals of the two candidates they prefer. Congress plays a very significant dual role in foreign policy—one of interpreting the rationale of foreign policy to its constituencies and one of translating popular sentiment to the executive branch. An effective and viable foreign policy requires a constant interplay between what the experts propose and what the American people speaking through Congress are willing to support.

In addition to its role as the medium for the expression of popular sentiment on foreign policy, congressional review assures the democratic process in foreign policy making. The rigid attitude of strict Presidential supremacy bespeaks a lack of faith in the democratic process; it assumes that the President will always make the right decision and that Presidential judgment is inherently superior to congressional judgment. If we do not accept this logic in domestic matters—and indeed we do not—then why should it be true in foreign matters? Let me remind you that to increase the scope of Presidential discretion in foreign policy is not to increase the depth of Presidential wisdom or perception. Whatever may be wrong with our foreign policy cannot be corrected by the simple expedient of vesting more power in the President.

My friends, whatever "powers" the House of Representatives may need to influence foreign policy today are clearly within our reach. The Congress—and especially the House—should assume greater control over foreign policy. Let us review each foreign aid appropriation with an eye for tangible and intangible results as well as for economy; let us make trade policy with a view to world as well as domestic markets; let us conduct each hearing with the dual purpose of evaluation and education—only then can we make reasoned judgments and sound criticisms. And when we criticize let each of us be willing to propose a possible alternative—for if you believe, as I do, that this body has a genuine role in the conduct of foreign policy, then we must be willing to assume the responsibility that such a role implies.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

CONGRESSMAN HORTON CALLS FOR CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVE

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] in expressing my deep and urgent concern for the diminishing role of the House of Representatives and of the Congress as a whole in the making of foreign policy decisions. This is not the first time I have taken the floor to urge a forthright and continuing role for the representatives of the American people in shaping the direction and extent of our policies and commitments abroad, nor will it be the last.

The United States is party to intricate economic, social, and military ties with nearly every nation on earth. Every aspect of these relationships—from food shipments to India to the four-power agreement governing Berlin and to the involvement of our forces and aid programs in southeast Asia—is carried out by Federal agencies which look to the Congress for their power, their funds, their personnel, and their equipment.

Every tool that is used to carry out U.S. foreign relations is forged in the committeerooms of Congress. Commonsense dictates that in forging these tools, Congress should have a great deal to say about how and where they will be used. While we in the House have utilized every avenue of information and opinion to enhance our understanding of foreign policy goals, our role in the actual guidance and formulation of policy has consistently diminished in recent years. This is true partially because those in the executive branch who are responsible for carrying out foreign policy have chosen not to "talk turkey" on policy questions with the representatives of the people. Too many times, committee hearings on foreign aid, on Vietnam, on the Atlantic alliance, and on the U.N. have served as mere forums for administration spokesmen seeking to justify present policies. Full and free discussions of alternatives or variations in policy are infrequent. Often, when questioned as to the wisdom of adopting alternative goals or methods, these spokesmen dampen the opportunity for frank discussion with vague, if factual answers. With this attitude on the part of many in the executive, disturbing changes have taken place in the foreign policy roles of Congress and the people. An immediate result of the absence of frank foreign policy discussions in Congress has been a rerouting of public expressions on foreign affairs, often into less sophisticated channels. Having made it difficult for the people's views on policy to be adequately considered on Capitol Hill, the administration has encouraged the transfer of this public expression to placards in the streets and to other indirect avenues.

Another result of the overly defensive attitude of policymakers—toward what may indeed be sound foreign policy—has been an unhealthy crystallization of opinion on foreign policy. Because the State Department has been too quick to defend its decisions against suggestions for change, many people presume that the Department has something to hide, that we are not being told everything, or that there are inherent wrongs in our foreign activities. I doubt very much that the administration has been dishonest with Congress or the people on these crucial issues, and I believe their defense of policy is undertaken in complete sincerity. Nevertheless, the overemphasis on justifying present operations to the point of dampening frank and open congressional discussion has encouraged those who doubt the wisdom of these operations to defend their views just as quickly, and in some cases dogmatically.

This unhealthy "credibility gap" on foreign policy can be solved if the people's doubts and fears are given full and fair airing at the highest level of Government—not just in the newspapers and in the streets. We in Congress who have labored to achieve frequent and complete discussions of these issues must redouble our efforts. We must not allow the executive to look upon this effort as an attempt to undermine present policy. On the contrary, we would be attempting only to improve or sustain executive policy by weighing it carefully and fairly against the views of the people and their Representatives—as dictated by the precepts of our democratic system.

On many occasions, I have offered resolutions in Congress designed to influence the direction of U.S. policy abroad. I have urged a permanent peacekeeping force in the United Nations. I have chided the administration for its lack of initiative and new direction in the Atlantic alliance; I have urged policies which would encourage free societies in Communist Eastern Europe; I have urged policies which would deny aid or economic benefit to nations which help our foes in combat. All of these policy goals have come from the American people. Some of them fit well into the overall structure of our foreign relationships, some may not, but all of them deserve open and frank discussion in the Halls of Congress and in the policymaking branches of the executive.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the role of Congress in foreign affairs must be strengthened and broadened. It is Congress which provides our Government with the tools for carrying out foreign policy and it is Congress which expresses the will of the American people on all Federal matters. Thus, the rightful place for public exchanges of opinion on the most pressing issues of the day is here. Every representative of the people, and every member of the executive must work to achieve this goal, for all of us, regardless of our views on policy particulars, have in mind the best interests of the United States of America and its role in the world.

Every day, the many shades of interests and opinion on domestic issues are blended into workable and effective programs by Congress. The same process of discussion and blending must take place with regard to foreign policy issues, if Americans are to continue in trusting and supporting the actions of their Government, and if Americans are to retain their traditional voice in the conduct of international affairs.

THE SECURITY OF THIS NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor of the House at this time because I am deeply concerned with the security of this Nation. The safeguard of our freedoms for 190 glorious years has been the Constitution of the United States, a document described as "the greatest instrument of freedom ever produced by man." Our Founding Fathers, divinely inspired, brought forth an instrument which changed the course of history and established upon this earth a new concept of man's relationship to government. In their farseeing wisdom the framers of the Constitution adopted the basic principles of the separation of powers to make it impossible for a monarch, a dictator, or any small band of power-mad zealots to seize control of the government established of, for, and by the people.

There have been contests during these 190 years between the executive branch and the Congress to upset this balance of power, but heretofore neither executive nor Congress, nor the judiciary has been able to force its will upon the other bodies. Now this is not true.

Over the past several years the responsibilities and powers of Congress have been steadily eroded by a Supreme Court which far exceeded its constitutional functions and by an executive branch which seems to hold in disdain both the Constitution and the Congress. This steady encroachment upon the powers of the Congress has reached a climax under the present administration through the manipulation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and more particularly by Harold Howe II, the Commissioner of Education. Making no pretense that it is his determination to use the power of his office and the support of the President to force his social philosophy upon the people of this country, Harold Howe has pressed down upon the brow of the South a crown of thorns as cruel and as torturous as that pressed upon the head of the Prince of Peace when they crucified Him on the cross.

The school guidelines engineered and put into action by Harold Howe are wreaking havoc among the schools of my beloved State of Alabama and other States of the South. While we are his victims today, I warn my colleagues that should he succeed in his effort, the long dreaded federalization of schools in America will be consummated in every State in the Union. Harold Howe seeks to assume authority over every local school board in this country. It is a recognized fact that the high standard of education attained in America for more children of every race, color, and economic condition than in any other place has been the result of local control of the schools. Who knows better what is the best education for their children than the mothers, fathers, neighbors, and local officials of every city, town, and hamlet across the land? There is no more dedicated group of public officials at any level of government than members of local school boards. They serve in most instances without compensation, often at great personal sacrifices, with long hours of toil to raise money to build schools, hire the best teachers available, and approve curriculums which will best prepare the children of their community to go into the world.

I say, Mr. Speaker, I would rather trust the destiny of my children—and I have three, the oldest just starting in the first grade—to the dedicated service of local school board officials than to the social philosophy of Harold Howe.

You who do not live in the South and have not yet experienced his heavy-handed autocracy cannot appreciate the damage he is doing to education. In Alabama our local school boards and our good people have been bending every

possible effort to improve the standard of education for every boy and girl in our State. We have been endeavoring to build schools, to add new classrooms, to increase our teaching staffs, and although we are not as wealthy as some of our sister States, we have been making progress. Now comes Harold Howe with orders to realign our school boundaries, reassign students upon the basis of race even if it means closing badly needed schools and firing highly qualified teachers.

I say that is wrong, Mr. Speaker. I say that anything that hurts the education of a single boy or girl in Alabama or in any other State is a criminal act against the youth of the Nation.

Harold Howe was never given this authority by Congress. In fact, he has far exceeded the intent of Congress as expressed in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In his ruthlessness to impose his will upon the States and the local school boards he has arrogantly ignored the will of Congress and instituted his own will over the people of the United States. By these acts he has forfeited the right to hold public office. He is a constant danger to the orderly process of government under the Constitution and a serious threat to the freedom of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to arouse the Congress and the Nation to the danger of Harold Howe's guidelines for many months. On April 5 of this year I wired to the superintendents of local school systems in my State through Alabama State Superintendent of Education, Dr. Austin Meadows, the following telegram:

This is to offer my assistance to Alabama Superintendents of Education in their opposition to the Federal Guidelines. I would appreciate your sending me such information relative to the present school situation and how these Guidelines will affect our system. This will be most helpful in our opposition to these unjust proposals. I think that the entire Alabama delegation should request a meeting with the Commissioner of Education and your presence at such a meeting would add support to our cause. Please let me hear from you if you can be with us and let us know what date will fit in with your schedule.

Subsequent to sending this wire I wrote to the President of the United States asking him to rescind these guidelines—

Because they are illegal and will destroy the sincere and orderly efforts which are being made by the officials and people of Alabama to comply with the law. The enforcement of such unreasonable and unfair demands threatens the education of all Alabama school children including the children of the poor.

At the same time my fellow Republican Members of Congress from Alabama and I met with Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II in an effort to reach a reasonable and fair compromise on the guidelines. We spent 2 hours with the Commissioner of Education and we were unable to shake his determination to demand unquestionable obedience to his edicts by Alabama State officials and local school boards. He threatened to withhold all school money from any Alabama school district which would not comply with the demands of his guidelines. In the entire 2 hours I spent in his office I saw nothing in the Office of Education which dealt with education. Even when I requested some evidence of activities in behalf of improved education, the Commissioner would not produce it. The entire effort of the Office of Education seemed to me at that time to be to enforce its own ideas of social reform.

I pointed out to the Commissioner of Education in April that the people of our State were making every reasonable and fair effort to comply with the law, and all we asked was that we be allowed to meet the requirements so as not to hurt our schools or result in a lowering of educational standards for our children, especially our poor children. His only reply seemed to be that total compliance with the guidelines must be brought about immediately even if it meant closing good schools and overcrowding existing facilities.

Through April, May, and June I urged this Congress to stop this power-grab and disregard of Congress intent by the Commissioner of Education. In company with other Members of Congress from all the Southern States we met again with the Commissioner of Education to point out the recklessness of his actions. All to no avail. Harold Howe has set himself above Congress. He has assumed the position that he and he alone is the law, and that he and he alone is the sole interpreter of legislation passed by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, if this Republic is to be secure we dare not allow a hireling to exert such autocratic disdain for the elected representatives of the people of the United States. We must take action now to rescind these vicious, illegal, and unconstitutional school guidelines as well as the other guidelines imposed on the schools and hospitals of our country.

I have introduced a bill in conjunction with other Members of this body to prevent any agency or division of the Executive from exceeding its authority. I urge every Member of this House who is concerned with the education of the children of America and with proper responsibilities of Congress of the United States to pass this bill H.R. 17764. This should and must be done before this Congress adjourns or we face the complete destruction of our public school system.

In the meantime this Congress should demand that the President remove from office immediately the present Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II. To do less reflects upon the strength and determination of this legislative body. I hope I will have your full support of these vital moves in this critical hour for this Nation.

AIR POLLUTION IN NEW YORK CITY AND NATURAL GAS AS SUBSTITUTE FUEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, 1966, the Federal Power Commission held a hearing in connection with an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to allow Consolidated Edison in New York City to obtain additional natural gas for fuel purposes in New York City.

My concern with this question was based upon the need for an all-out assault on the air pollution problem in the city, and especially in the borough of Manhattan and that part of it which I represent.

The problem of air pollution, of course, is not confined to this core of the city of New York, and it is for that reason that my statement at this hearing, which was presided over by the FPC's Examiner, Francis L. Hall, is brought before my colleagues for their perusal.

The statement follows, along with pertinent material I submitted with my statement:

Mr. Examiner Francis Hall, gentlemen, on December 15, 1965, Mayor John V. Lindsay asked his Task Force on Air Pollution to study the problem of air pollution in the City of New York, and to make a comprehensive report with recommendations for adequate, corrective measures.

The purpose of the Task Force was to make a fundamental analysis and to arrive at fundamental approaches.

On May 10, 1966, the Task Force, headed by its Chairman, Norman Cousins, reported to the Mayor. The report of the Task Force, entitled, "Freedom to Breathe," is a necessary document with which all New Yorkers and others should be concerned. While the aim of the Task Force has been not just to find short-term answers, but to define and pursue the basic elements of a comprehensive, effective and long-lasting program, it deals with the immediate problems presented by the greatest single source of air pollution in New York City: Consolidated Edison.

The Task Force states:

"Consolidated Edison has figured prominently in the deliberations of the Task Force for a simple reason: It is the largest single producer of foul air in the City of New York.

"Con Ed last year burned more than ten billion pounds of bituminous coal inside the City limits of New York. This represented more than 90 percent of all the soft coal burned in New York City. Coal burning produces smoke, soot, and grime; it also produces sulfur dioxide, sulfur trioxide, and oxides of nitrogen, all of which are irritating to human tissue.

"In 1965, coal accounted for about 40 percent of Con Ed's total combustion of fuels.

"In 1965, Con Ed also burned some 800 million gallons of fuel oil. Fuel oil produces considerably less smoke than coal, but it generally produces more sulfur dioxide and sulfur trioxide.

"In 1965, oil represented 39 percent of Con Ed's total combustion inside the City limits.

"Nineteen percent of Con Ed's electricity last year was generated by the burning of natural gas, which contains no sulfur and produces no soot.

"The approximate remaining 2 percent of Con Ed's total combustion was generated by nuclear power at Indian Point, outside the City."

Con Ed is aware that it is polluting New York's air. But as the Mayor's Task Force points out, the central fact remains that Consolidated Edison today lacks sufficient reserve power-generated capacity. In other words, Con Ed is not in a position to shut down individual installations long enough to

make extensive improvements, or to install new equipment.

The Task Force's succinct statement which follows recognizes that Con Ed therefore poses two major problems for the City of New York:

"The first has to do with limited ability to meet peak-power demands, carrying with it the danger of overloading and consequent power failure. The second has to do with present inability to control the pollutants being pumped into the air."

And the issue squarely set forth by the Report is:

"How is it possible to increase generating capacity to meet New York's spiraling power needs, and at the same time, update existing equipment, and at the same time, use fuels in a way that will reduce all pollutants?"

This brings us to the point in question today. It is a fact that residual fuel oil produces the greatest quantity of sulfur dioxide and sulfur trioxide emissions. It is also a fact that natural gas used as a substitute for residual fuel oil, or other fuel (coal) is cleaner and therefore produces the least amount of air pollution.

The U.S. Federal Power Commission issued an order on March 1, 1966, which granted a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity pursuant to an application in Docket No. CP65-181 filed by Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Corporation (hereinafter Transco), pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act.

In other words, the FPC temporary approval allowed an additional 55,000 Mcf per day to be supplied to Consolidated Edison under Transco's CD-3 rate schedule, thereby bringing Con Ed's natural gas slightly above 25 percent of Con Ed's total supply of fuels. The 9th and 11th short-term recommendations of the Task Force's report in Chapter 9 concerning Consolidated Edison state:

"9. By way of further increasing its reserve capacity, Con Ed should apply to the Federal Power Commission for authorization to build up its use of natural gas to 30 percent of its total fuel use. . . . 11. Con Ed should begin now to develop a plan for the substitute use of natural gas and distillate fuel oil for coal and residual oil in the event of an air pollution emergency episode."

Transco's application for temporary authorization was opposed by the Commission's staff and by Fuels Research Council, Inc., National Coal Association and the United Mine Workers of America. Transco's application was supported by Con Ed and the City of New York. On May 18, 1966, Mayor John V. Lindsay, my predecessor in the 17th Congressional District, and one who has long been a hard-fighting enemy of air pollution, announced that Con Ed had entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the City of New York.

Mayor Lindsay and the City of New York support Con Ed's application to the FPC for authorization to bring additional natural gas to New York City not only because the City of New York agreed to support Con Ed in its application pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding, but because the dangers inherent in the air pollution dilemna with which New York is presently faced are imminent.

On March 29, 1966, I expressed my concern that the Federal Power Commission should not display a cavalier attitude toward its New York City air pollution problems. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 19, 1966 at pages 8482-8483. After extensive hearings, the FPC, on March 1, 1966, granted temporary one-year authorization to Con Ed beginning April 1, 1966, but stated that, "The determination to issue the temporary (authorization) has in no way been influenced by the air pollution issue raised by the City of New York and Con Ed."

The basis on which the Federal Power Commission stated that they temporarily authorized the natural gas is unfortunate. Here is one case where Consolidated Edison, which is normally charged with contributing to air pollution, is attempting to take steps to lessen it, and yet the Federal Government has chosen to discount this factor in making its determination.

I was happy to receive a letter on April 14 from Mr. Lee C. White, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, expressing assurance that it was not the intention of the March 1st order to treat lightly the problem of air pollution in New York City. Mr. White further assured me that when the case comes before the Commission full consideration will be given to evidence on the question of New York City's air pollution.

Evidence of air pollution is not difficult to find. The Task Force Report, for example, lists a variety of sources in New York City, including:

"New York City's eleven Municipal refuse-disposal stations.

"New York City's Housing Authority projects.

"Privately owned apartment houses and office buildings.

"Approximately 600,000 private residences.

"Con Ed's eleven power-generating stations inside the City.

"Approximately 8,500 industrial manufacturing establishments.

"Demolition and construction dust.

"Ordinary street dirt.

"Approximately 13,000 lunchrooms and restaurants.

"Approximately 1,500,000 automobiles, buses and trucks.

"Emanations from approximately 400,000 takeoff or landing operations of jet aircraft at New York airports each year.

"Approximately 25,000 steamship operations in New York.

"Pollution by air invasion, dirty air drifts from hundreds of miles away, especially from nearby New Jersey, with its relatively uncontrolled industrial complexes and incinerators."

Other cities and metropolitan complexes are faced with similar sources of air pollution.

A good deal has been learned in recent years about air pollution; its damaging effects and how to control it.

Yet, despite the tremendous growth of urban areas in the Twentieth Century, no Federal program in the field of air pollution was begun until 1955, under the Eisenhower Administration.

In July of that year, the President signed Public Law 84-159, authorizing the Surgeon General, under the direction of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to begin a research and technical assistance program to combat air pollution. The Surgeon General was also authorized to encourage cooperation among State and local agencies and to disseminate information relating to air pollution surveys and activities. This early program did not, however, grant to the Surgeon General or the Secretary of HEW any powers of control or regulation.

Although the Surgeon General was subsequently authorized in 1960 (Public Law 86-493) to study the problem of motor vehicle exhaust pollution, Federal action languished in this field until the First Session of the 88th Congress. At that time, Senator RIBICOFF of Connecticut and Representative Roberts of Alabama, supported by several colleagues in the House, sponsored the bill that became the Clean Air Act when signed into law on December 17, 1963. (Public Law 88-206).

The Clean Air Act authorized research and a national program to develop new control techniques and to train personnel to administer and run air pollution control agencies.

As passed, however, the Clean Air Act was limited in scope. Almost immediately improvements were proposed. The result of these proposals was a series of amendments, passed by the first session of the 89th Congress and signed by President Johnson on October 20, 1965. These measures gave the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare authority to control air pollution from new motor vehicles and to investigate and seek to prevent new sources of air pollution from coming into being. They also authorized the Secretary to take action to abate air pollution which originates in the United States and which endangers the health or welfare of persons in neighboring countries and to construct, staff, and equip facilities to carry out these added responsibilities under the amended Clean Air Act. (Public Law 89-272).

Introduced as S. 306 by Senator MUSKIE and others and by several members in the House, these amendments initiated positive Federal action in reducing some actual pollution, where the earlier bill had approached the problem only theoretically. Still no significant effort was made, however, to control the pollution created by private sources or by municipal and State agencies; these latter two provinces were left to the domain of the States.

Under the auspices of these early Federal activities, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has conducted continuing studies of the problem of air pollution, and their findings as a result of these investigations have pointed out new directions for intensified Federal activities.

In June, 1965, for example, the HEW report (Senate document No. 42—June, 1965) discussing automotive air pollution revealed that vehicle operation under low temperature and at high altitudes tends to increase exhaust hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide. Naturally, these factors tend to intensify the hydrocarbon-exhaust problems and dangers discussed above. It was this report by HEW that led Senator MUSKIE to sponsor new amendments to the Clean Air Act to deal more extensively and thoroughly with the problem of automotive exhaust. This new legislation is currently (September, 1966) pending before Senator MUSKIE's Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works.

That more positive action toward reducing the level of pollution is needed is indicated by the fact that, as of the passage of the Clean Air Act in 1963, only 34 local control programs had annual budgets exceeding $25,000 although 308 urban places were then deemed to be suffering from major air pollution problems.

Moreover, as many as 51 of these local agencies tried in 1963 to function on less than $10,000 per year. (Committee on Public Works, Staff Report, September, 1963).

As the Senate Subcommittee of Water and Air Pollution reported to the full Public Works Committee, there is a strong need for uniformity in the legal controls of air pollution throughout the country. The futility of controlling the quality of industrial byproducts and of regulating air pollution in one locality when a neighboring community is administering less stringent standards is clear.

In 1963, the Muskie Subcommittee recommended the legislation of national minimum standards for automobile exhaust gases. The 1965 amendments to the Clean Air Act took steps toward that goal, but only authorized the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to establish standards for new automobiles, while the regulation of older models, which are most in need of air pollution control devices, was bypassed.

In this connection I wrote to the Secretary of the Department of HEW to ask him to set similar standards to control emissions from diesel-powered engines as presently exist for the manufacture and importation of new gas-powered cars and which have application to the 1968 model year. In my letter of September 1, 1966, to Secretary Gardner I further stated:

"With the increasing number of passengers traveling by bus and with the growing demand for materials transported by truck, diesel-powered vehicles, which are among the worst polluters of our urban atmosphere, continue to expel more and more noxious fumes and smoke into the air. The failure to include this irritating source of pollution under the control of standards comparable to those you have already established for gasoline-powered vehicles can no longer be sustained." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Sept. 22, 1966 at p. 23717.)

On September 22, 1966, I was pleased to receive a reply from Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, in which he stated:

"DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: We concur completely in the opinions expressed in your August 31 letter to Secretary Gardner regarding the offensiveness of emissions from diesel-powered motor vehicles. A 1957 survey conducted by the Air Pollution Control Association found that smoke and odor from diesels are the preponderant causes of citizens' air pollution complaints—even though diesel vehicles represent only 0.4 percent of the total vehicles registered in the United States for street and highway operation."

At present, the Federal Government sponsors several small scale activities being coordinated through the Division of Air Pollution of the HEW, such as education of the public on air pollution problems. The Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, and the Department of the Interior also maintain small facilities for research but these offices are mainly concerned with the solution of local, specific problems of limited scope.

The various states also maintain air pollution offices, but the variance among these disparate agencies is so great as to render meaningful coordination of existing efforts virtually useless in terms of establishing national uniformity.

Although there are several bills now pending before the second session of the 89th Congress, most appear to fail to attack the central problems of air pollution. With the exception of S. 560 introduced by Senator MUSKIE and others, the present bills deal either with very limited aspects of the overall problem or have received unfavorable reports from the executive agencies under whose jurisdiction their implementation might fall.

Senator DOUGLAS' Bill (S. 3400) to amend the Clean Air Act of 1963 calls for a research and development program with regard to solid-waste disposal as related to the destruction of junked automobiles. This legislation would deal only with the narrow problem of one type of solid-waste disposal and does not attempt to cope with the problem of industrial waste on a more comprehensive scale.

Similarly, S. 2940, proposed by Senator NELSON of Wisconsin, would reorganize and centralize Federal activities in the field of waste management, but the coordination of research programs it seeks under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Solid-Waste Disposal Act has been rejected as unsound in method by all executive agencies which submitted reports to the Muskie Subcommittee. (Reports of HEW, Interior, Budget Bureau, and Housing and Urban Development—Summarized in Calendar of Senate Public Works Committee, May 1966).

As this Session nears an end, the two bills which may have some chance of passing the current Session of the Congress (89th-2nd) are those offered by Senator MUSKIE, with support from several colleagues. Introduced as S. 560, the more important of these two Muskie bills is designed to "provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies, to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities, and to control automotive vehicle air pollution." This amendment was largely inspired by the HEW report cited above.

The other Muskie bill now pending before the Senator's Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution is S. 3112 which, with its House counterpart, H.R. 13199 introduced by Rep. STAGGERS of West Virginia, would provide additional grants to local agencies for maintaining and improving local programs.

To understand the magnitude of the air pollution problem is to accept the fact that we need immediate and far-reaching programs to control and retard the advance of air pollution.

One method of control, suggested by Governor Rockefeller of New York, is a tripartite plan in which the main provision would be a tax incentive offered to industries which voluntarily take measures reducing their pollution levels.

The other facets of the Rockefeller proposals are mandatory controls of industrial pollution and the investment of definitive authority in an Air Pollution Commission. Such a commission would necessitate a careful amalgamation of the now semi-independent activities of the agencies listed above.

In this regard I have introduced legislation which would provide help to industries who wish to take active steps to reduce air pollution.

My bill, H.R. 18095, would amend the Internal Revenue Code to liberalize the tax treatment accorded facilities for air pollution abatement. The aim of the bill is to encourage industry to act promptly to build facilities designed to control air and water pollution by providing a 20 percent tax credit for such investments. According to H.R. 18095, the facilities could be paid for as they are built or financed over a term up to five years. Congressman CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. of Ohio has been a leader on this question.

At present, the most practical organizational approach to the immediate problem of air pollution might be to work through the Secretary of HEW in curbing effectively those pollution practices for which we have the adequate detection and control technology and to develop as rapidly as possible the additional necessary techniques for pollution abatement.

The President's Environmental Pollution Panel has also made several recommendations for research that merit immediate consideration. Greater knowledge must, for example, be gleaned about the effects of excesses of lead in the air and the biological burdens thereby created, with an eye toward possible regulation of all noncombustible additives put into automobile fuel. Similarly, the effects of high lead contents in the air upon vegetation and upon the foods grown near highways must be more thoroughly understood.

Other programs should be undertaken immediately to explore the effects of pesticides now sprayed into the air and carried from agricultural areas to neighboring urban centers. The inter-relationship of rural and urban air masses is such that the concerns of the farmer and the urbanite inevitably and inseparably intertwine.

All of these suggestions should be implemented, but the emphasis of the research programs thus sponsored should be toward immediate implementation of practices to stem further exacerbation of the problems, rather than simply toward long-term, theoretical studies, such as have up to the present time been a major part of Federal programs.

Where Senator DOUGLAS' bill (S. 3400) recommended control and regulation of the disposal of junked automobiles, for example, some form of incentive might prove more effective against long-term storage of junked automobiles and the disposal problems that are created by large volume than would the forms of simple restriction proposed in the Douglas bill.

Under the 1965 amendments to the Clean Air Act, the Secretary of HEW is authorized to establish standards for controlling air pollution in any Governmental installation. The President's Environmental Pollution Panel recommends that this power of establishing and enforcing standards be expanded to include all activities in any way supported by Federal funds. Insofar as this recommendation encompasses a sound and necessary principle, it deserves support; but a more desirable method of implementation might be to combine such an extension of the Secretary's powers with a provision calling upon each State to enact legislation establishing and enforcing standards for all industry and air pollution sources within the State. Should such State action be forthcoming, the necessity for Federal controls outside of Federal installations would be alleviated, and a reduction of the Federal jurisdiction in air pollution would become more feasible.

Even if each State were to enforce such standards, however, it would still be desirable to urge the formation of regional compacts and unified authorities to administer the air pollution control activities in multistate metropolitan areas. Although small-scale efforts in this direction have been undertaken in the New York City area, these prototype compacts, as Mayor Lindsay's Task Force Report points out, have been endowed with minimal authority and jurisdiction.

Senator JAVITS of New York has encouraged the formation of more comprehensive regional agencies, and Federal action in the immediate future should offer strong similar encouragement. Likewise, research programs should be intensified, under the aegis of the Clean Air Act, with the goal of developing techniques for predicting local air movements which affect large regions encompassing several State jurisdictions.

Also of major importance, especially in the urban areas, is the need for intensive investigation into the elimination and control of sulfur pollution in the atmosphere. At the present relatively uncontrolled rate of pollution, 23 million tons of sulfur oxides (primarily sulfur dioxide) are poured into the air each year (National Academy of Sciences Publication 1400, Waste Management and Control). Because of the deleterious effect of lung tissue penetration by sulfur dioxide, the magnitude of this pollution creates especially serious problems to congested cities.

According to the report by the National Academy of Sciences (Waste Management and Control), the generation of electricity by fossil-fuel burning, the byproducts of various industries, and the residues of home-heating by oil burning are the three major sources of sulfur dioxide contamination (22.3 million tons of the 23 million tons each year).

For an urban center like New York City, and especially the 17th Congressional District, which I represent, the importance of immediate control of sulfur pollution is evident when one realizes the immensity of the power-generating operation within the City. The Academy's report states that each fossil-fuel power-generating plant, such as those which comprise Consolidated Edison's New York City power system, may emit as much

as several hundred tons of sulfur dioxide per day.

A subject which is still relatively new and which has until now been beclouded with emotionalism and genuine problems of safety techniques is the generation of electrical power by nuclear reactors. For the reasons outlined above, however, some viable alternative must soon be found to present means of electrical power generation.

Although nuclear technology has advanced significantly in recent years, the state of the art is not yet such as to justify the construction of reactors within the territorial jurisdictions of urban centers, according to Mayor Lindsay's Task Force Report and most scientific authorities. Because of the psychological and emotional reactions which greet the prospects of constructing nuclear generators within cities, intensive research must be undertaken upon improving control and protection methods associated with nuclear-source electricity. Moreover, the possibility of long-distance transmission of power thus generated, either over unused railroad rights-of-way as suggested by Mayor Lindsay's Task Force or by underground cables, must be more thoroughly developed.

As the National Academy of Sciences Report mentioned earlier points out, one of the primary reasons that these techniques and others discussed above have not been developed and implemented as rapidly as might be possible is that the refinement and manufacture of proper equipment has not been economically profitable. It is difficult and often impractical for certain industries to spend the large human and financial resources needed to apply proper control techniques to their own air pollution activities.

The existence of waste material which constitute environmental pollutants represents intrinsic inefficiency in the industrial process. Just as a few industries are able to utilize profitably every product of their particular manufacturing processes, so also would all other industries wish to eliminate costly wastes. At present, however, most industries accept some degree of waste-production as unavoidable.

Federal encouragement should now be given to private sources to develop a new, autonomous industry to accept this challenge. To combat pollution by eliminating unused byproducts a separate and distinct industry can and should be developed for research and development of techniques and equipment to utilize presently unwanted residues.

In this connection, I have been studying for some time methods of accelerating the Federal, State and local efforts to effectively eliminate harmful emissions of oxides of sulfur.

One of my first orders of business next year would be to introduce legislation designed to meet this problem by amending the Clean Air Act to provide the Secretary of HEW with authority to award grants and contracts to private industry for research to develop an economically feasible system for the commercial utilization of sulfur byproducts of fuel combustions.

The oxides of sulfur, for example, could be converted into H_2SO_4 or Sulfuric Acid, which if produced in a sufficiently high grade or quality, could be sold to nearby markets.

The legislation I would introduce further amends the Clean Air Act to authorize the Secretary of HEW to establish and enforce with appropriate sanctions Federal standards for sulfur emissions for those States which failed to submit acceptable proposals for State supervision and enforcement of air pollution criteria.

The urban market for this new byproduct-utilization industry is large and unserviced. There can be little question that our city-oriented society suffers badly from this neglect. Even if one assumes, for example, that 50 percent of the nation's electric generating capacity will be nuclear-powered by the year 2000, the Academy of Sciences estimates that pollutants resulting from fossil-fuel generation of electricity will double by 1980 and redouble by 2000.

Faced with this prediction as only one small aspect of the expanding pollution problem, we should examine the desirability of byproduct-utilization as one of the most effective long-term approaches to controlling and eliminating atmospheric contamination. That a separate and distinct industry is now needed to effectuate this goal is indicated by the inefficiency of the limited efforts which have until now been performed as small subsidiary activities by existing enterprises.

Right now studies are being made to determine how natural gas can be economically obtained from coal. This would eliminate pollution before it occurs and should be encouraged. I am informed by Michael A. Gibbs, Esquire, of Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Inc., that serious investigation is being given to this question by these well-known management consultants. (See Coal Age, January 1966, following at the end of this statement.)

Throughout the first half of the Twentieth Century, Federal activity in the field of air pollution was nonexistent. The past eleven years have seen life breathed into exploratory and limited projects which have provided the indispensible foundation upon which to build future programs. The severity of the problem today and the imminent danger of future tragic deterioration render limited efforts no longer wise or safe.

Mr. Hall, gentlemen, I thank the Federal Power Commission for the opportunity to submit this statement today.

Gentlemen, I was happy to have had the opportunity to submit this statement which I am bringing to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

It is my earnest hope that we can all work together to help control and combat the increasing and complex problems of air pollution. Thank you.

[Reprinted from the Pacific Coast Gas Association proceedings, vol. 56, 1965]

PIPELINE GAS FROM COAL AND OIL SHALE

(By Henry R. Linden, Director, Institute of Gas Technology)

(Dr. Henry R. Linden, director of the Institute of Gas Technology since 1947, was formerly with Socony Mobil Oil Company in Brooklyn. Dr. Linden is an adjunct professor of gas technology at Illinois Institute of Technology, and a vice president and board member of IGT's new commercialization and management service subsidiary. He has authored or co-authored some 60 publications and has received numerous awards for his technical work. A chemical engineering graduate of Georgia Institute of Technology, Dr. Linden earned his master's degree in chemical engineering from the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn and his Ph. D. from Illinois Tech. He is a member of the American Chemical Society and The American Petroleum Institute.)

[Figures referred to in this article cannot be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.]

FOSSIL FUEL DEMAND AND SUPPLY

A well-documented projection of energy demands from 1960 to 2000 was published by Resources for the Future Inc. in 1963 (Table No. 1).[1] According to the median projection of this study, the net production of natural gas would have to rise to 24.5 trillion cubic feet by 1980, and 34.9 trillion cubic feet by the year 2000 to meet the domestic demand. These projections are conservative in that, despite this large increase, natural gas would not retain its present share of the energy market.

TABLE 1.—*Current and projected distribution of energy consumption*

	Energy consumption, 10^{13} B.t.u.				
	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000
Coal	11.1	13.0	15.8	16.4	18.0
Petroleum and natural gas liquids	19.4	25.2	32.9	44.0	61.7
Natural gas	13.3	19.1	24.2	28.4	33.8
Hydropower	1.6	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.8
Nuclear power	------	.4	3.7	10.3	18.9
Total	45.4	60.2	79.2	101.9	135.2
Natural gas, percent of total	29.2	31.8	30.5	27.8	25.0

Source: "Resources in America's Future." [1]

Based on a projection of the historical trend of domestic natural gas production and discoveries, 1740 trillion cubic feet of natural gas will ultimately be recovered. This agrees with several recent projections based on considerations other than historical trends. Subtracting the 243 trillion cubic feet which had been produced by the end of 1964, leaves a recoverable reserve of about 1500 trillion cubic feet (Table No. 2). This would be adequate to meet the anticipated requirements beyond the year 2000 so long as the reserves can be discovered in time and at a low enough cost to meet market demands.

Again, based on projections of historical trends of production and discoveries, 225 billion barrels of domestic crude oil ultimately will be recovered. This is close to one of the best documented recent predictions.[8] Subtracting total oil production through 1964 of 75 billion barrels, leaves a recoverable reserve of 150 billion barrels (Table No. 2). This is lower than those estimates in which it is assumed that the recovery of crude oil actually in the ground will exceed the amount that can be projected from historical data.[1] For example, if the present one-third recovery of the crude contained in oil-producing formations could be increased to two-thirds, remaining reserves would be about 300 billion barrels. Thus, roughly, the recoverable domestic Btu. reserve of gaseous and liquid hydrocarbons are of the same order of magnitude—100 to 200 quadrillion Btu.

In spite of the equivalence of domestic reserves, there are major differences in the natural gas and crude oil supply picture. First, domestic crude oil is already being supplemented by imports. These are equivalent to 20 percent of consumption in spite of continuing pressures to keep such imports to a minimum. Second, an alternate supply exists in the form of fully developed processes for retorting oil shale from the high-grade Green River formation in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming (Table No. 2). Up to 750 billion barrels of this synthetic crude can be produced. Refined products from it are already nearly competitive with products from conventional sources. Thus, with the large world supply of low-cost crude oil and the huge potential sources from domestic oil shale, any possible limitations on domestic crude oil supply should have little effect on the petroleum industry's share of the market for energy.

In the future, imports of natural gas may become as significant as the imports of crude oil are now. In 1962, net pipeline imports from Canada and Mexico amounted to 0.4 trilion cubic feet. This is about 3 percent of consumption.[9] Liquefied natural gas transported by tankers is a commercial operation overseas. In spite of its costing more than pipeline gas, it may soon become an important source of peak supply on the

---

See footnotes at end of article.

east and west coasts because it can now be stored economically and safely as a liquid near the point of use.

What is needed then by the gas industry to assure an essentially perpetual source of its commodity—methane—is the equivalent of the synthetic crude oil supply of the petroleum industry and the nuclear energy supply of the electric industry. The mere existence of such a source, if it meets reasonable economic tests, provides many immediate tangible benefits such as increased consumer and investor confidence. In the long range, it should be a major stimulus to optimum development of natural gas supplies at relatively stable costs.

TABLE 2.—*U.S. fossil fuel reserves, Jan. 1, 1965*

	Proved recoverable		Estimated recoverable	
	Billions of units	Quadrillion (10^{15}) B.t.u.	Billions of units	Quadrillion (10^{15}) B.t.u.
Natural gas, MCF	a 283	b 293	c 1,500	b 1,550
Natural gas liquids (barrels)	a 7.7	d 33	e 41	d 170
Crude oil (barrels)	a 31.0	f 180	g 150	f 870
Oil shale (barrels assay)	h 250	j 1,450	k 750	j 4,350
Coal ton m	50	1,038	830	17,300

(a) Reference 2.

(b) Natural gas heating = 1035 Btu. per CF.

(c) Based on author's estimate of 1740 trillion CF. ultimate discoveries, less 137 trillion CF. of cumulated production through 1956,[3] and less 105.95 trillion CF. cumulated production from 1957 through 1964.[2]

(d) Natural gas liquids heating value = 4,200,000 Btu. per bbl.

(e) Estimated to be in same ratio to future natural gas recoveries as for proved reserves.

(f) Crude oil heating value = 5,800,000 Btu. per bbl.

(g) Based on author's estimate of 225 billion barrel ultimate recovery with only those improvements in recovery technology reflected by historical trends, less 75.05 billion barrel total production to January 1, 1965.[2 4]

(h) 50 percent recovery from Green River formation deposits in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming averaging 25 gal. per ton, as estimated in Reference 5.

(j) Crude shale oil heating value = 5,800,000 Btu. per bbl.

(k) 50 percent recovery from total Green River formation deposits, as estimated in Reference 6.

(m) Reference 7. CF. = cubic foot at 14.65 psia and 60°F; MCF. = 1000 CF.

Fortunately, the gas industry has a potential source of gas supply which, in many respects, is superior to the equivalent alternate supplies of competing energy industries. This is synthetic pipeline gas from coal. As will be shown later, even before the cost reductions that always come with commercialization, all indications are that in many areas the initial price of synthetic pipeline gas will only be slightly higher than wholesale natural gas. Compared to nuclear power generation just a few years ago, this is indeed a promising starting point.

THE ROLE OF SYNTHETIC PIPELINE GAS

The concept of supplementing natural gas supplies with synthetic methane has received much attention for about 20 years. At the end of 1965, the American Gas Association will have invested about 4 million dollars in R & D on the production of synthetic pipeline gas from coal and oil shale. Substantial programs on coal gasification also have been conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Mines. Recently, by sponsoring several major research programs, the Office of Coal Research of the U.S. Department of the Interior has given new impetus to work this field. Over the years, the Institute of Gas Technology has maintained the most comprehensive process development program for synthetic pipeline gas. Fig. 1 shows the annual expenditures and sources of funds since 1946. Overseas, the British Gas and Fuel Research Boards, the British Gas Council, and the British Coal Utilization Research Association have been active in fields closely related to production of pipeline-quality gas from coal. However, in recent years, the British gas industry has looked toward petroleum products and liquefied natural gas as its major raw materials for the future. In the remainder of Europe, the future also belongs to natural gas and petroleum-based gasification processes. In Australia, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization still has active programs on coal gasification. However, the future of this development is questionable since there have been major finds of natural gas near the population centers.

In the U.S. a unique situation exists. It favors the future production of supplemental base-load gas from coal for the following reasons:

(1) Bituminous coal or lignite are available relatively near the major population centers at 10 to 20 cents per million Btu., whereas petroleum feed-stocks suitable for gasification cost from 30 cents to $1 per million Btu.

(2) Recoverable coal reserves are tremendous. They are nearly eight times the combined reserves of gaseous and liquid hydrocarbon (Table No. 2) after allowing for mining losses of 50 percent. More than half of these coal reserves are recoverable at present cost to 1½ times present cost. Subtracting estimated coal consumption of 25 billion tons of conventional uses between 1960 and 2000, and subtracting conversion losses, leaves an amount sufficient to produce 11 to 12,000 trillion cubic feet of pipeline gas.

(3) Future fuel cost trends favor coal as a raw material since the major coal market—thermal power plants—is under attack by nuclear energy. This has already resulted in a decline in coal prices through rapid improvements in mining techniques, shut down of uneconomical mines, and substantial reductions in transportation costs. From all indications, this trend will continue.

(4) The growing network of long-distance gas transmission lines and storage reservoirs will be able to accept supplemental quantities of synthetic pipeline gas in increments of 100 million cubic feet per day and up, at any time the cost of this gas becomes competitive with equivalent increments of new natural gas at the point of delivery. These competitive levels—about 40 to 50 cents per Mcf, near most of the population centers—are attainable with the coal-based processes now under development. Oil-shale based processes do not appear to have prospects that are quite as good. However, technologic progress may bring into contention synthetic pipeline gas from this tremendous source—a source that is capable of providing at least 3000 trillion cubic feet of natural gas equivalents.

The advances in synthetic pipeline gas technology can best be demonstrated by recent decreases in estimated gas prices. This is shown in Figs. 2, 3, and 4 for bituminous coal lignite, and oil shale. Except for oil shale, synthetic gas prices are rapidly approaching the wholesale price for natural gas in areas where these raw materials are abundant. The synthetic gas prices are 20-year averages. They were computed by an accounting procedure developed by the General Accounting Committee of the American Gas Association. This procedure is based on the financing of utility gas plants at 65 percent debt and 35 percent equity. Straight-line depreciation is assumed over a 20-year period. Interest charged is 5 percent of the outstanding debt. A 7 percent return on an undepreciated fixed investment is assumed. The 20-year average capital charge composed of federal income tax, debt, and net income amounts to about 5.8 percent. State and local taxes and insurance are taken at 3 percent and annual depreciation at 5 percent. It is felt that these financial arrangements best fit the needs of a regulated utility which would be engaged in this gas manufacturing activity.

SYNTHETIC PIPELINE GAS PROCESSES

Two basic processes for the production of synthetic pipeline gas from coal are in an advanced state of development. The one with the most development work behind it is shown schematically in Fig. 5. Coal is almost completely gasified with steam and oxygen at 2500 to 3000° F. to form a mixture of hydrogen and carbon oxides (synthesis gas). This gas is then purified and converted to methane by being passed over a catalyst at 700 to 900° F. The entire operation is conducted at a pressure of several hundred pounds per square inch.

This methanation process has been demonstrated in a large pilot plant in the U.S. by both the Institute of Gas Technology and the Bureau of Mines, and in Great Britain by the Gas Research Board. All components of this process, except the methane synthesis unit, have been used commercially. Even the synthesis unit could be commercialized readily using available research results and design information for industrial scale liquid fuel synthesis units.

Unfortunately, an economic evaluation of this process shows that gas prices will be about $1 per million Btu. for a 90 billion Btu. per day plant (90–100 million cubic feet per day of 900–1000 Btu. per cubic foot gas) using bituminous coal that costs $4 per ton. Such a plant would require about 6500 tons of coal per day. It would have to produce about 4500 tons of oxygen per day for the gasifier if a suspension gasification system is used. The plant would cost about 100 million dollars. The overall thermal efficiency would be about 50 percent.

With a fixed-bed gasifier, only about 2300 tons of oxygen would be needed per day. However, U.S. bituminous coals cake in such a gasifier. This means that the coal would require a costly pretreatment which would wipe out the savings from the lower requirements for oxygen. The plant's thermal efficiency may be a little higher, possibly 55 percent, which corresponds to a somewhat lower coal consumption of 6200 tons per day. However, all of these gains are offset by higher investment costs and the net result is roughly, the same cost for the gas.

A more promising process economically is hydrogasification. In this process, coal, or char is reacted directly with hydrogen to form methane. The materials are reacted at about 1000 pounds per square inch pressure at 1100 to 1700° F. The less reactive portion of the coal, usually 50 to 60 percent, is used to produce hydrogen. A number of variations of this process are being developed on a large pilot plant scale. The two giving the lowest projected costs for gas are shown schematically in Figs. 6 and 7. In both of these schemes, a mixture of hydrogen and

See footnotes at end of article.

steam is fed to the hydrogasifier. This improves the thermal efficiency of the overall process from about 60 percent without steam to 70 percent or more with steam. Efficiency is increased by using the heat released by the coal-hydrogen reaction which forms methane. This heat is used to decompose some of the steam by reaction with coal to form hydrogen and carbon oxides. Thus, the requirements for external hydrogen are reduced which, in turn, reduces investment costs.

The difference between the processes of Figs. 6 and 7 is this: In the first process, the hydrogen is produced by purification of synthesis gas generated by conventional steam-oxygen gasification under pressure. In the second method, the hydrogen is produced by the continuous high-pressure steam-iron process. This new process is under development at the Institute of Gas Technology by Con-Gas Service Corporation, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, and Consolidation Coal Company.

The process requires no oxygen. Instead, hydrogen is produced by the decomposition of steam on a circulating steam of hot, reduced iron ore. The iron is oxidized in this step. It is then reduced with producer gas to complete the cycle (See Fig. 7). The producer gas is generated by the partial oxidation of residual char from the hydro-gasifier with air and steam. The hot mixture of hydrogen and unreacted steam from the oxidizer is fed directly into the hydrogasifier.

A hydrogasification plant producing about 90 billion Btu. per day of pipeline gas and using conventional hydrogen production equipment (Fig. 6) will cost about 60 to 65 million dollars. It will consume about 4700 tons of bituminous coal per day, and require 1000 to 1100 tons of oxygen per day. It will produce gas costing about 60 to 65 cents per million Btu. from $4 per ton bituminous coal. These figures do not include anything for coal pretreatment. Until recently, this step in the process has been required to eliminate coal agglomeration in the hydrogasifier. Now, coal pretreatment is no longer deemed necessary thanks to the success of a large pilot plant research program at the Institute of Gas Technology, jointly sponsored by the American Gas Association and the Office of Coal Research.

With the steam-iron process, the potential cost of pipeline gas from $4 per ton bituminous coal could be reduced to 50 to 55 cents per million Btu. in a 90 billion Btu. per day plant costing as low as 40 to 45 million dollars.[10] As noted before, no oxygen is required. Coal consumption would be about 4800 tons per day. However, to accomplish this, a high-pressure gas producer would have to be developed which could generate from residual char the very high quality reducing gas needed for the steam-iron process.

As plant sizes are increased, even lower pipeline gas prices could be achieved. For example, in a plant producing 250 million cubic feet per day, the gas price would be about 5 cents per million Btu. lower than in the examples given before (Fig. 2). The coal cost of $4 per ton (14 to 15 cents per million Btu.) is also higher than the cost of coal in many favorable locations. Further, when using low-cost highly reactive lignite as a feed material, pipeline gas prices of about 40 cents per million Btu. are attainable (Fig. 3). Consolidation Coal Company is now developing such a lignite process for the Office of Coal Research. It uses a different technique for the gasification step. Called the CO_2 Acceptor process, it is similar to the steam-iron process in that it eliminates the need for oxygen.

Two methods are available for producing pipeline gas from oil shale. Oil shale is a sedimentary rock containing a high percentage of organic matter which is similar to petroleum. Both methods employ hydrogasification at 1300 to 1400°F. and 1000 pounds per square inch pressure, and both have been developed to a small pilot plant scale. In one method, the feed to the hydrogasifier is crude shale oil obtained by retorting oil shale in one of several processes that have been developed to a semi-commercial scale. Gas costs for this type of operation are excessive. (Fig. 4).

In the other method, crushed shale is fed and the organic matter in it is hydrogasified directly. The necessary hydrogen-rich gas for both types of operation is produced by one of the commercial processes that partially oxidize oil.

An oil shale plant that can produce 90 billion Btu. per day of pipeline gas is shown schematically in Fig. 8. It would require per day from 22,000 to 25,000 tons of oil shale having an oil assay of 40 gallons per ton. About half of the shale would be retorted to produce crude shale oil. The oil, then, would be used to produce hydrogen-rich gas and for fuel. Oxygen requirements may vary from 800 to 1700 tons per day depending on the ratio of hydrogen to oil shale fed, and the extent of processing of the partial oxidation product gas to increase its hydrogen content. The investment cost of such a plant would be about 55 to 60 million dollars. Pipeline gas prices from shale costing 72 cents per ton would be 55 to 60 cents per million Btu. Substantial reductions in gas costs undoubtedly can be achieved with further process development and with improvements in the technology of mining oil shale. However, these reductions will have to be greater than for the equivalent coal processes. The reason, of course, is the added expense of transporting pipeline gas produced in Colorado long distances to the major markets.

PROGRAM FOR SYNTHETIC PIPELINE GAS DEVELOPMENT

The present cooperative American Gas Association-Office of Coal Research program will lead to an engineering design of a prototype plant for producing synthetic pipeline gas from coal in 1967. It is fully expected that this design will show the feasibility of producing pipeline gas from bituminous coal on a commercial scale at the rate of 250 million cubic feet per day and at a cost of 50 cents per million Btu. If it does, construction and operation of the prototype plant will proceed and should be completed in 1970. Support for this phase of the program could come from the Office of Coal Research, from gas industry sources, or from a joint program such as the present.

In 1970, a decision could then be made to build one or more commercial plants to be in operation around 1975. This is a critical period in that, by then, natural gas discoveries may fall behind consumption unless there is a radical change in exploration activity or the demand for gas. The purpose of this limited number of commercial plants would be to confirm the gas industry's ability to produce large quantities of supplemental gas at a sufficiently low cost to be competitive in the residential, commercial, and high-value industrial markets. Such a confirmation may then spur the development of additional natural gas supplies at competitive costs. It should be noted that the construction of small synthetic pipeline gas plants to increase baseload gas supplies by 100 to 250 million cubic feet per day should involve no major expenses above those that would come with an equivalent reinforcement of long-distance natural gas pipeline supply systems. Capital costs of 50 to 150 million dollars would be comparable. Further, the judicious location of such plants in areas of low-cost coal supply near major markets should make the delivered costs of gas a stand-off.

If projected gas demands continue to hold up, a third generation of pipeline gas plants may have to be built to produce supplemental gas in trillion cubic feet per year quantities by 1985. For every trillion cubic feet of natural gas equivalent, 55 million tons of bituminous coal would have to be mined, or about 10 percent of the projected annual production at that time. Investment in plants capable of producing one trillion cubic feet of pipeline gas per year would be 1-¼ to 1-½ billion dollars. The mining facilities would cost another half billion dollars. Thus, it is apparent that extensive advance planning would be required to manufacture a significant portion of the demand for pipeline gas.

COMPARISON OF ENERGY COSTS—ELECTRICITY VS. GAS

The question arises as to why coal should be converted to pipeline gas instead of electricity. The answer lies in the comparative economics of the two systems of energy conversion and transportation.

First, the investment in a plant to make pipeline gas from coal would be substantially less than that for a coal-fired steam-electric plant with the same thermal energy output. The cost of a plant to produce pipeline gas would be $400 to $650 per million Btu. of daily capacity. The cost of a plant to produce electricity would be $1500 to $2000 per million Btu. of daily capacity. This is equivalent to $120 to $160 per kilowatt capability.

Second, the efficiency of converting coal to gas is substantially higher than that of converting coal to electricity. Efficiency in producing gas is 70 percent compared to a practical maximum of about 40 percent for steam-electric plants.

These two factors are largely responsible for the data in Fig. 9. It shows that gas, at the point of production, is competitive with the most advanced electric power generation systems, including any conceivable corrections for differences in utilization efficiency. An example is the Breed plant of the Indiana and Michigan Electric Company which represents the best current practice for coal-fired steam-electric plants. Its heat rate in 1963 was 8898 Btu. per net kilowatt hour. This is equivalent to a thermal efficiency of 38 percent.[11] The reported investment cost is $160 per kilowatt of installed capacity. The bus-bar cost, on the basis of a plant load factor of 95 percent, a coal cost of $4.50 per ton, and fixed charges of 14 percent, is 4.6 mills per kilowatt-hour, or $1.35 per million Btu. (the actual plant load factor reported for 1963 was 79 percent and the coal was $4.12 per ton [11]).

This energy cost is much more than that of pipeline gas from coal at the same coal cost, the same plant load factor, and allowing for the maximum difference in utilization efficiency. The cost advantage of synthetic pipeline gas is even greater when we compare it with the average production costs for about 60 new and newly expanded steam-electric plants. In 1964, these were estimated at 6.7 mills per kilowatt hour, which is equivalent to $1.95 per million Btu.

Since the costs of producing electricity from fossil fuels are not competitive with those for synthetic 1000-Btu. pipeline gas, the next question that arises is whether nuclear power might offer an advantage. The lowest nuclear power costs announced so far, are those for the Oyster Creek plant of the Jersey Central Power and Light Company. The estimated bus-bar cost at a load factor of 88 percent during the first five years of operation is 3.8 mills per kilowatt hour. During the latter stages of plant life it is estimated that the generating cost will rise to 4 mills per kilowatt hour.[12] This cost is equivalent to a range of about $1.10 to $1.20 per million Btu, over the life of the plant.

See footnotes at end of article.

Even after adjustment for the 95 percent load factor, the generating cost is reduced only to about $1.05 to $1.15 per million Btu. While this cost is somewhat below that for generating electricity from fossible fuels, it is still significantly higher than the corresponding costs of manufacturing utility gas.

The most important advantage of gas in supplying the ever-increasing amount of energy required is its low cost of transportation. This is shown in Fig. 10. Here the cost of transmitting electricity in the most advanced extra-high-voltage systems is compared with those for transportation of direct fossil fuel. For example, the latest costs prepared for the National Power Survey indicate that a 500 kilo-volt system could deliver 700 to 900 megawatts of power over a distance of 600 miles for about 2¼ mills per kilowatt hour.[13] This corresponds to about 11 cents per million Btu. per 100 miles. For comparison, a typical cost of transmitting gas is less than 1.5 cents per million Btu. per 100 miles. Lower costs of transmitting alternating current have been projected,[14] but even this very optimistic value is a multiple of the most of transporting gas.

Extra-high-voltage transmission of direct current is another possibility. The lowest estimated value is for the Pacific Northwest Intertie. It is based on Federal financing at 2½ percent interest. On this basis, the total delivered cost of power including line losses is 2.9 cents per million Btu. per 100 miles at 100 percent load factor for the 881-mile delivery system.[15] It was later stated by Charles F. Luce, Bonneville Power Administrator and Chairman of the task force of the Department of the Interior making the study, that private financing would increase these costs by 180 percent,[16] that is, to 8 cents per million Btu. per 100 miles. According to the National Power Survey, a direct current line charged to ±500 kilovolts could transmit a 1200 megawatt block of power for 1600 miles at a cost of somewhat less than 8 cents per million Btu. per 100 miles.[17] The reduced cost for the longer system appears reasonable since the cost of terminal facilities are allocated to longer transmission lines. In any event, it should be recognized that these costs make no provisions for providing firm power. Such assurance could significantly increase the cost of transmitting direct current.

When coal fueled processes are compared, an important factor that must be considered is the relative cost of transporting coal to the producing plant vs. transporting the plant's product in the form of electricity or pipeline gas. Coal may be transported either in railroad cars or as a slurry in pipelines. The technical success of the Consolidation Coal Company's slurry pipeline has led its proponents to project slurry transportation costs of as low as 3.0 cents per million Btu. per 100 miles for long-distance, high-volume systems (400 miles, 5 million tons per year). This cost includes appropriate charges for slurry preparation and dewatering.[18]

The railroads have responded to this challenge by developing rate schedules which reflect the advantages of assured large volume sales to a single customer. Freight rates of 3.1 cents per million Btu. per 100 miles have been noted in the National Power Survey for a 400-mile transportation system.[19] With these costs, and in view of the high conversion efficiency and the low cost of transmitting gas having a high heating value, there appears to be little economic incentive to transport the coal to a gas generating plant located near the point of consumption. However, mine-mouth generation of electricity apparently can be justified only if an extra-high-voltage intertie system is available to help equalize load factors.

The highest cost differential between gas and electricity is in distribution. As shown in Table No. 3, the large difference in energy cost to the residential consumer is due primarily to the 7:1 ratio in distribution costs. Based on 1964 data, these costs were $6.78 per million Btu. for electricity and $1.01 for gas.

TABLE 3.—*Distribution costs of gas and electricity*

	Cost, dollars per million B.t.u.* (1964 data)	
	Natural gas	Electricity
As produced	$0.16	**$1.95
At city gate	[20] .34	----------
At point of use:		
Average	[21] .61	[22] 4.75
Residential	[21] 1.01	[22] 6.78
Distribution cost, residential	.67	4.83

*1,000,000 B.t.u.=293 kilowatt-hours.
**Estimated.

Space heating—Synthetic pipeline gas vs. electricity

One of the major factors responsible or the good competitive position of pipeline gas for space heating is the low cost at which it can be stored in depleted oil and gas fields or in other suitable geological formations near the major marketing areas. A major unbalance in winter and summer demands results from the sale of a substantial portion of gas for space heating at a low load factor (typically, 25 percent). This situation can be handled economically by avoiding low load factor operation of the high investment cost, long-distance transmission lines. Recently, as a result of intensive research and development efforts, liquefied natural gas (LNG) storage has been developed to the point where it can be used for economic large-volume storage of gas where no natural underground reservoirs exist near the point of consumption.

Fig. 11 depicts a system for supplying the New York metropolitan area with 25 percent load factor space-heating gas. The system has these parameters: (1) hydrogasification of West Virginia coal to a 964 Btu. per SCF. gas, (2) transporting this gas for 400 miles, and (3) storing it for most of the year in liquid form to permit a total sendout of about 300 million cubic feet per day of 1000 Btu. per SCF. gas for a period of 90 days.

The increase in the heating value of the gas is due to the removal of low heating value components that are in synthetic pipeline gas (primarily hydrogen) during the liquefaction process. This portion of the gas is equivalent to about 15 percent of the heating value of the stored gas and is used as fuel for the liquefication plant.

Using typical investment and operating costs developed in a recent study of peakshaving with LNG,[23] the storage costs shown below were obtained:

	Million
Storage tanks at $4.20 per barrel	$23
Liquefication equipment at $270 per MMCF.-day	25
Revaporization equipment at $5 per MMCF.-day	1
Auxiliaries, land, etc	14
Total, plant investment	63

The costs of pipeline gas from coal, and of gas transmission, have already been discussed. The resulting city gate gas price of $1.15 per Mcf. is obtained by mixing 70 percent liquefied storage gas with 30 percent of incoming pipeline gas (Fig. 12). In actual practice, this ratio would vary because of the usual wide fluctuation in daily demand for peakshaving gas. However, the cost of the gas at an average (instead of a constant) load factor of 25 percent would not be affected significantly by the necessary increase in the maximum sendout capacity. The reason is that the cost of the regasification plant is a very minor portion of the total investment cost.

The cost of gas to a residential consumer in this example would be about $1.80 per million Btu. This is about 80 percent higher than the present cost for residential gas. However, it is still higher competitive with electric heating at typical current space-heating rates (equivalent to $3 to $5 per million Btu.) after allowing for differences in utilization efficiency.

An analysis was made of a similar but larger volume gas manufacturing system for the southern California market where storage in depleted oil and gas fields could be used (Fig. 13 and 14). The fortunate juxtaposition of large coal reserves of lower but acceptable heating value, and an adequate supply of water at a point not too far from the market area occurs in the Lake Powell region of southern Utah. Coal is available in the area for $3.25 to $3.50 per ton. It can be converted to pipeline quality gas in a plant having a capacity of 250 million cubic feet per day for approximately 57 cents per million Btu. The gas can be transported to the Los Angeles basin region, and redelivered to residential customers on a 33 percent load factor for a city gate price of about 81 cents per million Btu. When the U.S. average cost of distribution to residential customers (67 cents per million Btu.) is added, the delivered price is again less than $1.50 per million Btu.

Thus, in two major market areas which consume a substantial portion of residential utility gas, pipeline gas from coal in its present stage of development could compete with typical existing electric spaceheating rates.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is indebted largely to T. J. Joyce and also to P. S. Panos and C. L. Tsaros of the Institute of Gas Technology staff for providing much of the background information for this paper.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Landsberg, H. H., Fischman, L. L. and Fisher, J. L., "Resources in America's Future." Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1963.

[2] American Gas Association, American Petroleum Institute and Canadian Petroleum Association, "Proved Reserves of Crude Oil, Natural Gas Liquids and Natural Gas," Vol. 19 (1964).

[3] Miller, R. L., "A New Look at Ultimate Natural Gas Reserves," World Oil 147, 222–24 (1958) October.

[4] American Petroleum Institutes, "Petroleum Facts and Figures," Centennial Ed. New York: The Institute, 1959.

[5] Duncan, D. C., Independent Petrol, Association of America Monthly 29, 22, 49–51 (1958) August.

[6] Cameron, R. J., "Energy Resources and Technology," U.S. 86th Congress, 1st Session, Subcommittee on Technology and Energy Resources of the Joint Economics Committee, October 12–16, 1959, 173–202 (1959).

[7] Averitt, P., "Coal Reserves of the United States," U.S. Geological Survey Bull. 1136. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Office, 1961.

[8] Hubbert, M. K., "Energy Resources," Publication 1000–D. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences—National Research Couucil, 1962.

[9] American Gas Association, "1964 Gas Facts, 1963 Data." New York: The Association, 1964.

[10] Benson, H. E. and Tsaros, C. L., "Conversion of Fossil Fuels to Utility Gas," American Chemical Society Division of Fuel Chemistry Preprints Vol. 9, No. 2, 104–10 (1965).

[11] U.S. Federal Power Commission, "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, Fifteenth Annual Supplement—1962, Sixteenth Annual Supplement–1963," F.P.C.S.–166. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Office, 1964.

[12] "Atom's Competitive Status in Historic Advance: Jersey Plant to Make Nuclear Pow-

er Under 4 mills," Nucleonics 22 17–18 (1964) March.

[13] U.S. Federal Power Commission, "National Power Survey," Vol. I, 152. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Office, 1964.

[14] U.S. Dept. of the Interior, "Report to the Panel on Civilian Technology on Coal Slurry Pipelines," May 1, 1962.

[15] U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Special Task Force, "Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Extra-High Voltage Common Carrier Interconnection," 1961.

[16] Luce, C. F., "A Second Look at the NW—SW Intertie Report," Electrical World 157, 30–33, 78 (1962) June 4.

[17] U.S. Federal Power Commission, "National Power Survey." Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Office, 1964.

[18] U.S. Federal Power Commission, "National Power Survey, Vol. II, 343. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Office, 1964.

[19] U.S. Federal Power Commission, "National Power Survey, Vol. II, 343. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Office, 1964.

[20] American Gas Association Statistical Bureau, New York, private communication, 1965.

[21] "Total Gas Utility Industry Customers, Sales and Revenues," A.G.A. Monthly 47, 4 (1965) January.

[22] Edison Electric Institute, "Statistical Year Book of the Electric Utility Industry for 1964—Advance Release," Table 46–S. New York: The Institute, 1965.

[23] Institute of Gas Technology, Unpublished Memorandum to the Central Hudson Gas and Electric Company, Project B-239, 1964.

THE CASE FOR SUPPLYING ALL NEEDS FOR ENERGY WITH GAS*

(By Henry R. Linden, director, Institute of Gas Technology)

In recent years, it has become rather widely accepted that a trend toward a completely electrified economy exists in our country. Many wish us to believe that it is inevitable. The happy goal of having all needs for energy in homes, commerce, and industry being satisfied with electricity has been thoroughly glamorized. In fact, it has only been recently that alternate sources of energy have received much attention at all.

We take a strong position that the increased use of electricity as our economy expands does not indicate any "trend" toward total electrification. The reason we don't believe it is simple—total electrification is just not economically sound. Let's consider some basic facts.

First of all, the main need for any form of energy is to produce heat. For example, over 85 percent of all energy used in homes is for heat. Less than 15 percent of the total energy needed is required in the form of electricity.

It follows then that there is little common sense in any energy supply system that requires (1) the conversion of heat to electricity in a central power station, (2) the transportation of this energy through an electric transmission and distribution system, and finally (3) the reconversion of the electricity back to heat at the point of consumption. To construct and operate such an electric system costs far more than it does to produce, transmit, and distribute energy for heat in the form of pipeline gas.

This is shown by the current rates for gas and electricity. The average price of enough electricity to produce one million Btu ranges from $2.65 for industrial consumers to $6.75 for residential consumers. By comparison, the average price of gas ranges from $0.35 to $1.00 per million Btu. For strict accuracy, these gas prices must be corrected to account for the efficiency of various gas burners. The correction, however, is relatively small. It does not seriously affect the basic advantage of gas in most of its applications for heat.

Now let us consider the comparatively small amount of energy that is needed in the form of electricity. Here again, electricity can be supplied, at a competitive cost in most markets, by transporting gas to the point of consumption and using it to generate electricity onsite.

Some will immediately question this statement by pointing out the higher load factor and lower investment cost for equipment in a central electric power station. And it is true that these costs per kw of power are lower than they are for onsite systems. But there is still one more important factor that is often not considered. This is exhaust heat.

As we know, when any electric generator is operated, a considerable amount of heat is also produced. In a central power station, and with the exception of the needs for the station itself, this exhaust heat is wasted. It goes up the stacks or into a river or cooling towers.

By contrast, exhaust heat from an onsite electric generator can be recovered to provide both heating and air conditioning. This ability, combined with the lower cost of transporting gas, will frequently offset the lower generating costs of a central power station.

If this concept of using gas as the source for all energy is broadly accepted, it is obvious that considerably more gas will be sold. This immediately raises more questions. Just how adequate is the supply of gas over a long term? And, what are the relative economics of a total gas vs. a total electric supply system? This presentation will attempt to answer these questions. It will also review the prospects for applying and developing the technology that is necessary to have a total gas energy supply system that can satisfy all types of requirements.

Regulating agencies are already expressing considerable interest in this concept of total energy from gas. Gas is inherently more reliable. It can be stored in underground reservoirs and piping systems. It is not subject to an instantaneous failure in a large region due to a temporary overload of one unit in the system.

Investors have also shown increased interest in what could be a new era of rapid growth of the gas industry. There have been two such periods in the past. The first came around the turn of the century when gas became popular for cooking and water heating instead of just for illumination. The next growth period followed the development of long distance gas transmission systems. These permitted the vast reserves of natural gas to supply all energy demands for heat.

The magnitude of the increased demand for energy in the future almost staggers the imagination. One of the most carefully documented recent forecasts predicts that the total consumption of energy will nearly triple by the year 2000 and that gas will retain most of its present share of the market.[1] If this proves out, the consumption of gas will increase to 25 trillion cubic feet by 1980, and to 35 trillion cubic feet by the year 2000.

In the past, natural gas producers have maintained a much larger working inventory of proved reserves than is apparently necessary or economical. So, we can expect that the ratio of reserves to production will continue to decline to a level of about 12 years. This is what the domestic oil producers have maintained for over 30 years. On such a basis then, we will have to discover only 1,600 trillion cubic feet by the year 2000.

Will we discover this amount of gas? The answer seems to be "Yes." As you can see, if the historical trends continue, we can expect to discover more than 1,700 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that can be recovered economically. This figure agrees well with another from the U.S. Geological Survey.[2] Their estimate, based on geological data, is 2,000 trillion cubic feet. In addition, imports of pipeline gas and liquefied natural gas could substantially increase the amount available to U.S. consumers. So, it would seem that adequate supplies of gas for the rest of this century are reasonably assured.

However, if we are to achieve the optimum development of our natural gas resources with stable prices, we will need more than our present set of regulations and economic restraints and incentives. On the basis of the projected trends in the ratios of reserves to production and total production to total discoveries, the annual rate of discovery can remain relatively stable until 1975. But, after that, we will have to find a lot more gas than we have in the past. This will put severe pressures on the mechanism that we now have to control supply and price.

This is why the gas industry has supported a major program to make synthetic gas available. One aim of the program has been to increase the confidence of consumers and investors. The electric industry has done this with its atomic energy program and the petroleum industry with its oil from shale program. In the gas industry's program, the primary emphasis has been to develop an economical process to convert coal to a synthetic pipeline gas that virtually cannot be distinguished from natural gas.

The reason for selecting coal as the raw material is simple. We estimate that we will recover between 1,000 to 2,000 quadrillion Btu of both gas and oil in the future. (One quadrillion Btu is equivalent to one trillion cubic feet of natural gas.) By contrast, the reserves of coal that can be recovered economically are equivalent in heating value to 17,000 trillion cubic feet of gas! Even after allowing for coal consumption to the year 2000, we could make 11,000 to 12,000 trillion cubic feet of pipeline gas from this coal—40 times the current proved reserves of gas!

The American Gas Association has already invested $4 million at IGT to make this nearly inexhaustible source of gas available. In addition, individual sponsors and the Office of Coal Research of the Department of the Interior have invested several million dollars more in various phases of this program.

Now what has been accomplished by this effort? First, in just the last six years, the price of synthetic pipeline gas from bituminous coal has been brought down from more than $1 to 50 cents per million Btu. In the west north central states where low-cost lignite is available (we have already caught up with the wholesale price of natural gas. These prices are based on relatively small pilot plant tests scaled up to a plant that would have a capacity of 250 million cubic feet per day.

We hope to be able to confirm these figures soon in a prototype plant having a coal feed of 1 to 3 tons per hour. The aim in building and operating the prototype is to gain information needed to build a commercial plant by 1970 and have it in operation around 1975. Such a plant should be a very useful demonstration of an alternate and economical source of gas. As such, it should spur the development of natural gas supplies. Once this first commercial plant has

---

*Prepared for the Public Utilities Fortnightly.

[1] Landsberg, H. H., Fischman, L. L., and Fisher, J. L., "Resources in America's Future, Patterns of Requirements and Availabilities 1960–2000," Table A 15–19, p. 858. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1963.

[2] Hendricks, T. A., "Resources of Oil, Gas, and Natural-Gas Liquids in the United States and the World," U.S. Geol. Surv. Circ. 522, p. 17. Washington, D.C.: 1965.

demonstrated its abilities, the full development of a synthetic pipeline gas industry could then proceed if this is necessary. Large amounts of capital and coal will be required to produce even a trillion cubic feet of gas per year—only 5 percent of the projected demand.

One trillion cubic feet per year requires plant investment of $1¼ to $1½ billion; mine investment of $0.5 billion; and 55 million tons of bituminous coal.

ENERGY COSTS—GAS VS. ELECTRICITY

This still leaves the question: Why make *gas* from coal instead of making electricity from coal? The answer lies in the relative costs of producing, transporting and distributing energy. For example, coal can be converted into gas at nearly twice the efficiency of converting coal to electricity. Gas can also be stored more cheaply for use during periods of peak demand. And, further, a pipeline gas plant costs only a third as much per net unit of heat energy produced as a coal-fired electric plant. Consequently, even today, heat energy can be produced in a pipeline gas plant for one-half to one-third the cost in a thermal electric plant.

The cost of transporting energy for heat in the form of gas is about as low as for any other form of energy. Gas can be transported for only about one-eighth the cost of transporting electricity in even the most modern, extra-high-voltage alternating current systems. In long distance direct current systems, the best cost of transporting electricity is five times as much as for gas.

Finally, gas can be distributed for just a fraction of the cost of distributing electricity. The distribution of gas to homes costs about one-seventh the cost of distributing electricity. And this difference could easily increase still more if the electric industry is forced to put all of its lines underground.

	1964 data (per million B.t.u.'s)	
	Natural gas	Electricity
As produced	$0.16	$1.95
At city gate	.34	----------
At point of use:		
Average	.61	4.75
Residential	1.01	6.78
Distribution cost, residential	.67	4.83

The gas industry is fortunate that large deposits of coal, underground storage systems, and large-diameter transmission lines are all found close to each other and close to most centers of population. However, residential markets have an inherent low load factor. This means that when the costs of transmitting and storing gas are included, the delivered cost to a home will be about $1 per million Btu. But this figure is certainly competitive with the best residential rates for electricity which are $3 to $4 per million Btu even after allowing for differences in utilization efficiency. In addition to this, with continuing R&D we can expect further substantial reductions in the cost of gas.

GENERATING ELECTRICITY WITH GAS ONSITE

The biggest part of the market for premium energy is now supplied by gas. In 1964, for example, the figures in billions of therms for the amount of gas and electricity bought by homes, commercial customers, and industry look like this.

Homes: 38.9 gas versus 8.9 electricity.

Commercial: 12.9 gas versus 6.2 electricity.

Industry: 47.3 gas versus 18.1 electricity.

(Industrial figures exclude power plant sales.)

The generation of electricity onsite is the largest potential new market for gas. The reason is that the amount of energy required to produce electricity is about three times the figures just given for the amount of energy consumed. The expected increase in the amount of electricity used from 1970 to 1980 is equivalent to nearly $30 billion worth of natural gas and would require the installation of onsite generating equipment worth about $40 billion.

Vast potential markets exist for natural gas in on-site power generation

Consumer	Total new consumption, 1970–80*		Equivalent natural gas consumption, 1970–80	
	Billion kilowatt-hours	Billion dollars	Trillion cubic feet	Billion dollars
Residential	1,100	25.3	15.0	15.3
Commercial	550	12.1	6.3	5.0
Industrial and miscellaneous	1,850	16.8	25.3	8.9
Total	3,500	54.2	46.6	29.2

*From Electrical World, Feb. 22, 1965, p. 102 and "Resources in America's Future,'" the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1963, pp. 837–838.

The gas industry now has, or will develop by 1970, gas-fueled onsite energy systems that can capture a substantial portion of these markets. These include the following:

Residential Market: This market (1 to 10 kw demand) represents 30 percent of the total market for electricity. It can be served with gas operated fuel cells. The cost of a residential fuel cell power plant is expected to be between $100 and $150 per kw of peak output and will operate at an overall efficiency of at least 25 percent.

Commercial Market: This market (10 to 50 kw demand) consumes 20 percent of the total electricity used. It can also be served with fuel cells of a different type than those for homes. These would cost between $200 to $400 per kw and would operate at an overall efficiency of about 30 percent.

Small Industry Market: Small industries demand between 50 to 1,000 kw. They represent another 25 percent of the market for electric power. They are best served with gas turbine and engine systems. The first cost of such systems will vary between $100 and $400 per kw and operate at an overall efficiency of between 30 and 50 percent.

Large Industry Market: The final segment of the electric power market is made up of large industrial consumers. They account for the final 25 percent of the market. Their demand is for 1,000 kw or more. This can be served with large gas turbines having a first cost of less than $100 per kw and an overall efficiency of 25 percent.

The choice of an engine or turbine system is determined by an evaluation of economic factors as they apply to a specific installation. These factors are gas cost, load factor, investment cost, and the extent to which exhaust heat can be recovered and used. Even with today's prevailing rates for gas and electricity, commercial onsite and total energy systems fueled by gas can compete in many locations.

FUEL CELLS

Generating electricity onsite with fuel cells is of particular interest to those concerned with the future of the gas industry. It is perhaps unfortunate that the term "fuel cell" has become so widely used because it is misleading. These devices could be better described as "continuous feed batteries" or "galvanic combustion engines". In a fuel cell, the chemical energy of a fuel is converted directly into electrical energy by a silent, efficient, electrochemical process. The process requires no moving parts, hence, the devices operate without noise, require little maintenance, and have a potentially long life.

The essential components of any fuel cell are a fuel chamber, a fuel electrode, an ion-conducting electrolyte, an oxidant electrode and an oxidant chamber. Our interest at IGT is in fuel cells that use natural gas as a fuel and air as the oxidant.

Lately, you have heard much about fuel cells. Gemini 7 orbited the earth for 14 days with a fuel cell generating the electricity needed. Undoubtedly, you will hear more about them in the future in conjunction with U.S. military and space programs. The technology being developed by our government in these efforts is useful to us in achieving our goal of a commercial fuel cell. Unfortunately, the hardware being developed for the space program is not suitable, technically or economically, to generate electricity for commercial needs.

In Western Europe, however, more emphasis is being placed on the development of commercial fuel cells. In France, the national utilities, Gaz de France and Electricité de France, are seeking to develop fuel cells to generate power for small towns and villages. In Holland, the Dutch government is supporting research on fuel cells that use natural gas to generate direct current for aluminum production. In Germany and England, work is being done to develop hydocarbon fuel cells to propel trains and other vehicles. These efforts are closely related to IGT's program. They are all directed toward the achievement of practical commercial fuel cells.

At IGT, two major fuel cell programs are now in progress. The first is sponsored by the American Gas Association. It is directed toward the development of a fuel cell that operates at high-temperature (900 to 1300° F) and which uses an inexpensive molten salt electrolyte. The basic components of this system are a porous nickel fuel electrode, an electrolyte made up of alkali metal carbonates, and a porous copper air electrode. The fundamental fuel cell components produce relatively low voltage. Higher voltages are achieved by stacking cells into batteries. Based on the typical performance achieved with these components in 1965, material costs are $40 per kw. If the material costs are based on the *best* performance in 1965, they drop to $20 per kw. This cost allows us to project a future cost of $100 per kw for the hardware for a complete battery.

A second program, sponsored by the Southern California Gas Co., Southern Counties Gas Co. of California and Consolidated Natural Gas Service Company, Inc., is directed at the development of a low-temperature fuel cell system. The main components of this system are the fuel cell, its auxiliary cooling equipment, and a natural gas-fueled generator of hydrogen.

The process to generate the hydrogen used in this system has been developed by IGT for these sponsors over the last three years. Essentially, it involves three stages of chemical processing. It converts natural gas into a hydrogen-rich gas that contains only very small amounts of carbon monoxide. A fully automatic generator that can produce over 100 cubic feet per hour of hydrogen, enough to supply a 2 kw low temperature cell, is smaller than most water heaters.

Both the low- and high-temperature work at IGT is aimed at achieving a low cost relatively efficient power source, which can be used by the gas industry for a variety of applications. One application of particular interest is the installation of fuel cells in homes—the total energy from gas concept.

A typical system embodying this concept is shown here schematically.

This system consists of a 1½ kw dc power plant, a unit to step-up and invert the dc output of the fuel cell to 115 v, 60 cycle ac power, and an electrical energy storage unit. Such a system would be able to generate about 11,000 kilowatt hours per year. This is more than twice the amount of energy presently consumed in an average U.S. home. The energy storage system provides for the peak power demands of present U.S. homes. Furthermore, the energy storage system would provide at least 24 hours of highly reliable power in the event of a failure of a fuel cell component in this system. It is estimated that such a system will cost about $600 in 1980.

To compare the all-gas and all-electric concepts, two important facts must be remembered. First, the all-gas system is much more efficient in its use of energy. Second, the additional gas required to produce the electricity needed in a home already making the maximum use of conventional gas appliances is less than 15 percent. Most present distribution systems could easily carry this additional load since it would add only a small increment to the high winter peaks.

In a total gas energy supply system, the only significant losses are those up the stack from the various gas appliances and the efficiency losses of the fuel cell system itself. Note that the energy requirements needed in the form of electricity represent only 5 units while that needed for heat is 34 units. Thus, the most important factor in the high efficiency of a total gas energy home is the relatively large amount of gas used by the heating plant which operates at an efficiency of over 70 percent.

By contrast, consider a full scale acceptance of the all-electric concept. At best, the power plant generates electricity with an efficiency of only 40 percent and there are further significant losses in transmitting the current. No electric heat utilization factor, even 100 percent, will ever recover the heat that is lost at the power plant. In addition, the high demand for additional current to produce heat, would require major new investments in electric distributions systems.

Under present rate structures, in cities across the country, the cost of energy for total gas energy service would be about one-third of the cost for all electric service. Electric costs are based on data published by the Federal Power Commission.[3] Gas costs were determined from existing standard residential rates. No allowances were made for the possibility of special all-gas rates. In these examples, the energy requirements for the fuel cell system are based on efficiencies which have already been surpassed in the laboratory. Further advances will, of course, improve the picture. These savings will defray all operating and maintenance costs and quickly amortize the cost of fuel cell system equipment.

	All electric	All gas	Saving
Cleveland	$619	$135	$484
Philadelphia	540	226	314
Chicago	468	162	306
New Orleans	398	98	300
San Francisco	380	129	251

SUMMARY

We believe that the well advertised trend toward a total electric economy in the future is a myth. Such a system would cost far too much to build and operate. On the other hand, the concept of a system in which all energy is supplied by gas makes much more economic sense. It costs far less to produce, transmit, and distribute gas than electricity. And, a gas system is highly dependable and not subject to unexpected shut-down due to weather or failure of one local unit in an entire region.

The adequate supply of utility gas in the future is assured despite the tremendous increases in consumption that are expected. Natural gas will be available for many years. Our ability to produce high quality synthetic pipeline gas from coal and lignite assures a supply that is nearly inexhaustible.

The future will bring a substantial increase in the number of gasfueled systems installed to generate electricity onsite in homes, commercial establishments, and industry. A major contribution to this, will have been the highly successful current R&D work on utility gas fed fuel cells at the Institute of Gas Technology.

[3] Federal Power Commission, "All-Electric Homes, Annual Bills—January 1, 1963, Cities of 50,000 Population and More." Washington D.C.: Govt. Printing Office, 1963.

FLAGRANT MISSTATEMENTS OF FACT IN CONGRESS ON H.S. 820 GUN

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to document, today, further flagrant misstatements of fact made to Congress by the Pentagon in the H.S. 820 affair.

These misstatements concern other uses the Defense Department is planning for this substandard 20-millimeter cannon, in the face of flat assurances to Congress that this German-made gun was being bought only as an "interim weapon" for M-114 armored reconnaissance vehicles.

These misstatements, which I shall cite, are just one more concrete illustration, among the many I have been presenting since June 15, of how the Pentagon has consistently misled Congress, about the low quality of this weapon, its planned uses, and our real reasons for buying it.

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara himself has personally repeatedly assured inquiring committees in both Chambers that they are buying only enough of these controversial weapons to mount on our current inventory of M-114's. And that inventory is stable. In fact it is declining, because the M-114 went out of production last year.

Besides Mr. McNamara, other top Pentagon officials have also given repeated, explicit guarantees that this gun will be used only on the M-114.

For the purposes of brevity, I will cite just two of the most recent cases:

On March 10, 1966, Lt. Gen. William W. Dick, Jr., then chief of Army research and development, was questioned at a joint session of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

In response to a query by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, General Dick told the Senators that "it is the Army intention now to buy the Hispano-Suiza guns for this limited purpose of putting them on existing reconnaissance vehicles."

Also in March of this year, Lt. Gen. Ferdinand J. Chesarek, then the Army's Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, was questioned about the H.S. 820 by the House Appropriations Subcommittee.

The gentleman from Florida, Representative ROBERT SIKES, asked General Chesarek:

> Does the Army expect to make only a limited buy of the H.S. 820?

And the general responded:

> We expect to buy only enough for the M-114 vehicle and no more.

That is the same flat, unequivocal kind of assurance also given to the House Armed Services Committee and to all other committees and subcommittees of Congress that have anxiously inquired just what the Defense Department plans to do with this dubious weapon.

Yet what are the facts on the Pentagon's plans for this gun?

Directly contrary to the guarantees given Congress by Mr. McNamara and his top aids, the Department of Defense is already proceeding with plans to put this substandard weapon on at least two other vehicles, that I know of.

How many other, added missions are being contemplated for this gun, that have not come to my attention, I cannot say.

First, on instructions from the Defense Department, the Marine Corps has already ordered 15 of these guns to mount on the first 15 prototypes of the corps' new generation of amphibious landing vehicles, designated the LVT-PX-12. That stands for Landing Vehicle, Tracked, Personnel, Experimental, model 12.

First prototypes are scheduled for delivery by the F-M-C Corp., next March.

This vehicle, to be manned by a crew of three and designed to carry 25 marines fully combat equipped, will be the successor to the LVT-P5-A1, which is now the Marines' main amphibious landing craft.

While the exact final quantities that will ultimately be procured by the Marines are classified, the corps does state that it will be purchasing "well over 1,000" of these new vehicles.

Now, with the Army's proclivity toward slipping and sliding when caught in the act of misinforming Congress, I would not be surprised if the Pentagon tried to beg off in this instance by saying that they do not necessarily plan to equip all of the 1,000-plus new landing craft with the H.S. 820 as a main armament. Perhaps.

But as plans now stand, that craft is designed to mount the H.S. 820 automatic cannon as its major armament, with first quantities already ordered.

Contrast that, if you will, Mr. Speaker, with the flat, repeated assurances from Mr. McNamara and company that the H.S. 820 is to be used only on M-114 armored reconnaissance vehicles.

Second, it has been reported to me by Pentagon informants that the Defense

Department is now, or was recently, weighing plans to order the conversion of some 300 M–113 armored personnel carriers, to receive the H.S. 820.

I have also been unofficially informed, by friendly sources within the Defense Department, that active consideration is being given to the use of the H.S. 820 in South Vietnam.

Although the Department of the Army says that "that question has not yet been addressed," a top official of the Army Materiel Command acknowledged in a recent interview that he had been told the H.S. 820's use in Vietnam was "being considered."

If those reports are correct, then the logical conclusion would be that use of the gun in Vietnam is contemplated on the M–113 personnel carrier, which is widely employed in that theater.

That would square with the reports on the contemplated modification of the 300 M–113's, which are used to carry our troops into battle.

And where might the quantity of H.S. 820's be obtained that would be necessary to outfit new Marine amphibious vehicles, M–113 personnel carriers, and perhaps other vehicles?

There are two possible alternatives.

Although Congress has been assured that our procurement from West Germany's Rheinmetall Corp. and its associates will total only $75 million over 3 years, and cover only guns, ammunition and spare parts for the M–114, another, follow-on contract with Rheinmetall might well be signed.

It is more likely, however, that at least some of the guns to be procured under the present contract will be available for diversion to other uses.

It might be reasonably asked how that could be, since the Army tells us that the number of H.S. 820's we plan to buy—some 4,000 to 4,600—is roughly equal to our inventory of M–114's.

One reason for this, I believe, is that the Army may well not intend to equip all our M–114's with this substandard gun.

As I disclosed in my presentation of September 20, in a section at the end citing questions about the H.S. 820 which need to be answered, the Army's inventory of M–114's is undergoing rapid depreciation.

That problem is compounded, in reference to the H.S. 820, because the Army says the newest one-third of our M–114 inventory will receive the weapons first, and the oldest, most rapidly depreciating one-third are supposedly scheduled to receive the guns last, some 3 years from now.

Actually, as I disclosed September 20, cost studies which I am told the Army weapons command has conducted indicate that installation of the H.S. 820 on the oldest one-third of the M–114's will probably prove to be economically unfeasible, and installation on the middle one-third may be a marginal proposition at best.

Therefore it appears certain that contrary to the explicit assurances given to Congress, not all of the H.S. 820's being procured under the current contract are to go on M–114's. Instead, a sizable quantity will be available for use on other vehicles—such as the amphibious craft and the armored personnel carrier.

Because of the flagrant manner in which the Pentagon has broken its word to Congress in this instance, I took the matter up with Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor when we met 2 weeks ago, at his request, to discuss my continuing critique of the H.S. 820.

At that time, Secretary Resor made what was, to me, the astounding statement that since we have now contracted to buy the weapon, "the Army feels obligated at least to explore other possible uses" for the gun—the previous assurances to Congress notwithstanding.

What this means, of course, is that through this initial, supposedly "limited" purchase, this substandard gun and its ammunition are going to be introduced into our logistics system, and then—once in use—be given more new missions each year. Simply because "they are there."

Meanwhile, private industry's development of the vitally needed 25-millimeter successor weapon, needed to outgun the Russian 23-millimeter cannon, will continue at its present snail's pace, ignoring the need which is so critical that development of the successor weapon was recommended as far back as 1961, and urged in a "crash program" in an October 19, 1964, report to the Army staff by the Army Materiel Command.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one more instance in which the Congress has been given misstatements of fact about the H.S. 820 by Mr. McNamara personally, and by his top aids.

The other misstatements, as I have documented, were equally serious. In effect, they involved assurances that this gun was adequate for Army needs, when—as I have demonstrated in several speeches—the Army's own records show the weapon is inaccurate, malfunctions frequently, has deficient high explosive ammunition, and numerous other problems the Army is still trying to correct.

As I have also established, the Army actually agreed secretly to buy this weapon to give West Germany some U.S. arms business. And when it turned out that the gun could still not be made to work up to standard, after 5 years of testing and modification, then the standards were lowered to meet those of the gun.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that the appropriate committees of Congress launched a fullscale investigation of this procurement, and called Mr. McNamara and his Army aids into open hearings to explain to Congress why committees of both Houses and the public, have repeatedly been given misstatements of fact concerning this weapon.

I would think that the appropriate committees would, by now, have become tired, and perhaps a little embarrassed, at the continuing spectacle of a Secretary of Defense who is apparently so contemptuous of Congress that he believes it can be fed misstatements of fact with impunity.

The H.S. 820 is an unreliable, inaccurate weapon for the use now planned, and all the "Rube Goldberg" modifications that the Army has installed on it cannot make it otherwise.

I have documented that fact in House presentations during the past 3½ months.

It is time now for the full Congress to pick up the ball and carry it the rest of the way, toward the logical, follow-through objectives: Cancellation of the 3-year H.S. 820 contract at its first-year level; commencement of a crash program for the successor weapon, and a full congressional investigation of this "gun gap" and the reasons why we still do not have an acceptable weapon to combat Russia's 14.5-millimeter and 23-millimeter guns, after 6 years and $6 million in effort.

IS THE MILITARY ROLE OF NATO ENOUGH TO SUSTAIN IT?

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, more and more statesmen and scholars are pointing out the need to broaden the functions of NATO lest it fade away like all past military alliances.

One such is Prof. Leslie Lipson, a professor of political science at the University of California, Berkeley, who recently completed an assignment as director of studies of the Atlantic Institute in Paris. The Atlantic Institute is the international, nongovernmental organization whose purpose is, as an "idea factory," to promote unified action by those nations on both sides of the Atlantic which are willing to cooperate regarding their own development and the discharge of their world responsibilities. Its chairman is John J. McCloy, former U.S. High Commissioner in Germany.

Professor Lipson is one of 26 foreign policy specialists who have cooperated in a series of studies of the future of the Atlantic community conducted by the House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Community.

As chairman of that committee, I wish to bring the Lipson study to your attention. Here it is:

THE COORDINATION OF FOREIGN POLICIES IN NATO

(By Leslie Lipson, Director of Studies, Atlantic Institute, Paris, on leave from the University of California, Berkeley)

In a group of allies, the successful coordination of foreign policies depends on (1) an accurate recognition of established facts and changing situations, (2) realistic analysis of the various national interests involved, and (3) a broad agreement on long-term objectives. This memorandum will attempt a review of NATO's achievements and prospects with these criteria in mind.

NATO was originally constituted because of the existence of a clear and present danger. Stalin had declared his open hostility to the Marshall Plan. The Communist Party had engineered its coup in Czechoslovakia. The large Communist Parties of France and Italy were hampering their governments and were

fomenting industrial strife. It seemed probable that a Communist onslaught on western Europe was being prepared at a time when American forces had been substantially reduced, and this likelihood appeared ever more real in 1950 after the attack by North Korea on South Korea. Hence, the immediate motivation for the founding of NATO was the fear of invasion; and its initial functions, understandably and properly, were conceived in military terms.

Judged in this light, the record of NATO hitherto has been an unqualified success. Since its original purpose was to deter the Soviet Union from aggression against Western Europe, NATO has been fully vindicated by the results. The organization it established was an act of prevention, an insurance policy; and, precisely because of its existence, the calamity against which it offered protection never occurred. Nowadays, when the peoples of western Europe no longer live in apprehension of a Soviet military thrust, there are voices which proclaim that the shield can be dropped because the danger has lessened or has disappeared. But, if the NATO shield were in fact removed, or if, through the complacency of the member-governments, it were allowed to rust to the point of uselessness, would not the ensuing weakness of western Europe provide a temptation and whet anew the appetite of an aggressor?

If a city with a high crime-rate organizes its police force so effectively that crime is reduced, it does not then allow that force to disintegrate. But it will be wise to consider some measure of reorganization or redeployment. The same applies to NATO. The authors of this Alliance did not regard its framework as static or its provisions as unchangeable. In Article 10, they allowed for the possibility that other European States might be invited to join the Organization—as subsequently happened in the cases of Greece, Turkey, and West Germany. In Article 12, they stated that, after the Treaty had been in force for ten years, any Party could request that its terms be reviewed. Article 13 went further than this by permitting any member, after twenty years (i.e., in 1969), to give twelve months notice of its intention to withdraw from the Organization altogether. Thus far, only President de Gaulle has indicated that his Government might avail itself of this possibility.

The need for changes within NATO is due not only to the changes produced by NATO, but also to the evolution which has taken place both in western Europe and in the Communist world. Although the salient factors in this evolution are well-known, certain of their implications should be restated and evaluated together.

The economic recovery of western Europe is linked nowadays to two contradictory tendencies. While integrative associations, such as EEC, have been established, in some quarters these are matched by a resurgence of nationalistic sentiments which in turn give rise to a diversity of viewpoints on the subject of NATO's present capacity and future potential. This diversity is all to the good—as liberty itself is good—in promoting the maximum expression of ideas on which constructive cooperation may eventually be grounded. Even among those who are conscious of belonging to a broader community, divergences may legitimately arise from reasons of geographical location, defensive capability, economic resources, political tradition, and national culture—a list which is by no means exhaustive. It is such considerations which can often explain the different degrees of attachment on the part of particular countries or their governments to the concept of an Atlantic Community, or the varying emphases with which they uphold this policy or that. Feelings of national pride are none the less real—in small countries no less than in the great—and constitute a veritable political force, even though these may be based on unreal assessments of the objective situation. Likewise, a concept such as sovereignty may retain a symbolic appeal long after its logic has ceased to conform to the current laws of life.

The revival of self-confidence and the resulting assertiveness of western Europe are connected, paradoxically, with the possession of nuclear weapons by the U.S.S.R. In the "balance of terror", as it is called, between the United States and the Soviet Union, some Europeans believe they detect a situation which provides them with larger scope for diplomatic maneuver. From the premises that the nuclear weapons on the opposite sides cancel each other out, and that war between the two Super-Powers is for that reason improbable, the government of a small or medium-sized state may draw the conclusion that its security is guaranteed more or else automatically—whether it scrupulously follows the leader of the Alliance or not. That such a conclusion is almost certainly erroneous does not prevent it seeming persuasive to those who wish it were true and therefore act as if it were.

Viewed in another way, this style of thinking which, though typified by President de Gaulle, is by no means confined to him or to France, is a reaction, as unrealistic as it is excessive, to the undeniable fact that western Europe depends for its security on the United States. The crux of the problem can be stated thus: In an alliance composed of fifteen members, the bulk of the protection which all enjoy is provided essentially by the power of One. Yet, precisely because this is an Alliance which exalts the principle of freedom, because nearly all of the member-states are democracies, and because these are old nations with long memories and proud traditions, they do not readily resign themselves to complete dependence on another government in matters which may be vital, not merely to their security, but even to their survival. When people realize that decisions affecting peace or war can be taken in the capital of another country, over whose government they have no direct leverage or control, they tend to be hypercritical about decisions and the ways in which they are sometimes reached. While the privilege of deciding belongs to the suppliers of power, the prerogative of criticising remains with the consumers.

The foreign policies which one seeks to coordinate issue from the various member-states and are directed to solving certain central problems. The governments which are the most important to the United States—for the reason that their non-cooperation is, or would be, the source of the most acute difficulties—are Great Britain, France, and West Germany. The principal problems on which their agreement is sought are these: the reunification or continued division of Germany, military policy within NATO including the production and control of nuclear weapons, relations with the underdeveloped countries. The posture of the governments of our major allies, as well as the issues at stake in these questions, require some comment.

Among the Atlantic peoples, Great Britain occupies a unique position. This is a European country, situated so close to the continent as to share the influences of its commerce and culture. But it is also an island, with an ocean at its front door; and frequently throughout their modern history the avenues of opportunity have drawn the islanders towards the open sea. Linked by interest and propinquity to Europe, the British are united with North America by political and social affinity. Of them, one may say, adapting what Churchill has said of Canada, that they are the lynch-pin of the Atlantic world.

At the present time, the British confront a major turning-point in their long and epochal history. In Dean Acheson's phrase, they have lost an empire, but have not yet found a role. They need the association of a larger partnership, but are still unsure what form it will take, and what direction. By geography and history, alike, they are the natural members of an Atlantic grouping. But besides this more comprehensive union, they seek a place in smaller groups of more limited embrace.

For a decade and a half after the end of World War II, the British, when they looked beyond their island, felt closest to their Commonwealth. The United States, with which Britain prided itself on having a special relationship, occupied second place; and western Europe though geographically nearest, was psychologically a distant third. Recently, these priorities have been drastically shifted. Except for their traditional links with Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, the British are no longer at home in the Commonwealth which they once dominated and which appears more as a liability than as an asset. Hence, while continuing their close alignment with the United States, on whom they have become increasingly dependent for military and monetary support, they are now in the process of rediscovering the European continent where they have sought to establish commercial links. At the same time, however, the British retain from their imperial past a worldwide trading network, a series of military bases, and an influence derived from past experience and present example.

Some interesting comparisons can be made between the position of Britain and that of France under the presidency of General de Gaulle. Although the Gaullist regime has acquired the reputation of being our least accommodating European ally, actually there are certain similarities between French policy since 1958 and that of the British. France, too, has liquidated an empire, has recognized the Communist government of China, and is currently developing its own national force of rockets and nuclear bombs. As the seat of a culture which has gained international respect, they claim consideration, not only as a European people, but also as a world power.

These parallels are obscured, however, by two over-riding differences.

One of these, the extreme brusqueness of the General's diplomatic style, is attributable to traits of personality, which manifest themselves in much the same way whether in relations with Washington or London, or Brussels, or his domestic critics. The other salient characteristic of Gaullist policy has a deeper implication. It is the reassertion of an outlook which is strongly nationalistic, and, as such, stands opposed to any species of integration in larger unions, whether these be Atlantic or European. This resurgent nationalism, of which President de Gaulle has become the chief European exponent, unfortunately assumes the form of anti-Americanism for the reason that the pursuit of any separate national policy—be it strategic or diplomatic—must result in a challenge to the leadership in the Alliance of its strongest member.

It is, of course, easy to point out the contradictions in the Gaullist position and the unrealism of certain of its particulars. The General desires that Europe should be the equal partner of the United States, yet he is hostile to that European integration which alone could make equality genuine. He resents the fact of hegemony when it is exercised by the United States, but would welcome the hegemony of France. He insists on developing an independent French nuclear force, without recognizing that it cannot constitute by itself a deterrent to a would-be aggressor.

Yet, when all that has been said, there remains in the phenomenon of Gaullism an aspect which is not peculiar to the General himself or even to his country. In Germany, there are those in contemporary public life, who have been called Gaullists (Franz Josef Strauss is an example); and there are those at both extremes of the British political spectrum, the far Right as well as the far Left, who could qualify for the same label. Viewed in this light, the anti-American aspect of Gaullism exemplifies that general human reaction towards any power which is bigger and stronger and more successful—as was manifested in the past towards Great Britain and France and Germany in the days when hegemony was theirs. Along with gratitude and respect, envy and resentment are among the factors of which international politics must take account.

The relations of Germany both with the United States and with its European partners are another story. This is a people which bears a burden of guilt, but it is unevenly distributed. The new generation of young adults—those under 25 years of age—cannot be held responsible for the past excesses of German militarism or the crimes of Hitler. Innocent of such deeds, they aspire to a future in which they and their country will be treated as equals, whether as a wholly independent state or within any union or alliance. Among the older generation and those of middle-age, three points of view are discernible—nationalism, European unity, and close alignment with the United States. This last has been the official policy under Chancellors Adenauer and Erhard, because German security depends on American power. But that did not exclude a vigorous support for Europeanism by the Adenauer government, the climax being attained in the Franco-German treaty of reconciliation and cooperation.

The question of the future place of the German people in Europe was not settled by the defeat of Hitler's regime, and it was left to hang over from the bold war of Stalin's period, when were formed the two blocs which, despite a marked evolution, persist substantially today. Two of the vexed problems which illustrate so clearly both the need, and the difficulty, of coordinating foreign policies in the western Alliance are related directly to Germany. One is the choice between reunification or perpetuating the present division; the other concerns the production and control of nuclear weapons.

As to the former, weighty arguments exist on both sides of the question. In favor of reunification is the moral claim of the Germans to be treated as a single people and to live under a common government. Grounded on the principle of justice, such a claim comes inappropriately from that older generation which in past years allowed the power of a unified German state to be turned to aggressive ends. But the plea for justice has a very different sound when it is voiced by the young who represent their country's future and cannot fairly be identified with the evils of yesterday. The reverse side of this argument should also be considered. If the two parts of Germany are not reunited, a sense of injustice is likely to be intensified. In that case, a mood could become widespread, from which a Nazi-style movement might once again originate and a new potential Führer could base his power on the frustrated desire to be reunited.

But a case can also be made against reunification. If the two parts were rejoined, the resulting state would unquestionably be the strongest in Europe west of the Soviet Union. That being so, the Germans would become the arbiters of the European continent. If they should choose to align them with the U.S.S.R., the balance of power in the western world would be tilted decisively in Russia's favor. Conversely, if they aligned themselves with us, it would be tilted against Russia just as decisively. Manifestly, it is dangerous for either the United States or the U.S.S.R. to permit such a situation to arise; and for that reason, and in this sense, both we and the Russians may be considered to have a tacit common interest in keeping Germany divided as at present.

It could be suggested, however, that a reunited Germany might be prevented from dominating its neighbors, if, as a condition of reunification, it were required by treaty to accept limitations on its future armaments and, perhaps, to pursue a policy of neutrality (for which Austria supplies a precedent). But the answer to this is that, if a future German government were to violate such a treaty, it could not be enforced—except at the price of a major war. In terms of power, Germany is not to be classified along with Austria, and restrictions which are practicable and acceptable in the one case would be meaningless as applied to the other.

Further, if Germany is ever to be reunified, one needs to consider the method by which that would be brought about. All responsible men will rule out the use of force since, if employed in that situation for that purpose, it could involve a high risk of escalating into a major war conducted with nuclear bombs. If, on the other hand, Germany is to be reunited by peaceful means, not only must its immediate neighbors consent, but so must the United States and the Soviet Union. In view of the well-known Russian fears of German power, arising from the memories of the two world wars of this century, is there any possibility that the Soviet Government would ever consent to reunification?

Only one situation can be envisaged in which that is likely—namely, if the Russians become obsessed with another fear which exceeds their fear of the Germans: This may possibly occur when the government of China has completed the development of its nuclear weapons and the missiles required for their delivery. It will then possess the means to challenge the Russian occupation of Siberia and may seek to expand into that region. In that eventuality, the Russians will need to secure their position in the west, so as to be able to turn their whole attention to eastern Asia. Conceivably, they may be ready to pay the price of letting East Germany go. Until that time comes, if indeed it ever does, it seems most probable that Germany will remain divided.

The production and control of nuclear weapons raises questions of which some are specially connected with the German problem, while others reach out to the political, economic and military foundations of the Alliance. The various members of NATO differ markedly in their attitudes to nuclear bombs. Some of the smaller states, such as Denmark, refuse to admit these weapons to their country, fearing that they would then be a prime target for Russian attack in the event of war. France, for nationalistic reasons, has produced some nuclear bombs and rockets of its own, but does not permit American weapons of this kind on its territory. Britain, like France, possesses its own nuclear arsenal; but, unlike France, does allow American bombs on British soil. West Germany neither manufactures nor owns bombs, but American bombs are located within its borders under American control.

Can a common policy be produced from such dissimilars? My answer to this question must seek reconciliation of opposites. The military and economic factors tend, on the whole, in one direction; potential and psychological factors, in another.

It has already been proven that several countries in the western world, besides the United States, possess the technological capacity to produce nuclear bombs and long-range rockets. But it has also become clear that only the strongest of the economies can bear the cost (in manpower, finance, and materials) without suffering strain and sacrifice elsewhere. Judged in terms of economies and technology, there are only two systems which can be justified in the western Alliance: (1) production by the United States alone, or (2) production by NATO, and under its auspices, in a joint arrangement of the participating member-states. Either one of these methods has the advantage that it is unified and centralized, and thereby avoids the risks of indefinite proliferation.

In the military sphere, the same case can be made for unity and centralization in such matters as the control and custody of nuclear bombs and decisions concerning their use. These bombs are annihilating. With rockets, they arrive like lightning. Hence, there are the soundest military reasons for instituting an integrated command. If all deterrents fail and if a nuclear attack should ever be launched against the West, effective defense and counter-measures would require both unity and speed. The more fingers there are on the trigger, the less is the likelihood that these requirements can be met.

But these military, economic and technological considerations are offset by political and psychological factors, which foster the spread of national nuclear systems and a consequent decentralization of command and control. People are understandably apprehensive if others have the power to take the decisions on which it depends whether they will live or die. They seek alternative means, therefore, to protect themselves against possible errors of judgment—whence an allied government may conclude that the possession of a national deterrent, however limited in scope, affords some modicum of independence. In addition, a government which is nationalistic, and is influenced by considerations of prestige, may persuade itself that its status requires that it build a bomb of its own. Such feelings are understandable, though not justifiable. Still less justifiable is the international danger of indefinite proliferation which can result. It should be added that those European governments (i.e. France and Britain), whose policies in this field stimulate a German desire to do the same, are certainly those which strongly object to the production by Germans of a national nuclear bomb.

In sum, the following possibilities have to be considered: (1) Production and control of nuclear bombs solely by the United States for the NATO Allies. This runs counter to the national attitudes of certain European governments. (2) Continued proliferation of national nuclear systems within the Alliance. This involves the risks of independent action, and the dangers of indefinite nuclear proliferation. (3) A NATO solution. Production and control of all nuclear systems by members of the Alliance to be conducted solely under the authority and auspices of NATO. Questions: Would our Government agree to such an arrangement in principle? If so, could a satisfactory machinery be devised?

A third issue confronting the Alliance, and requiring some coordination of foreign policies, consists in the relations between the NATO countries and those of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Hitherto, apart from our confrontation with the Soviet Union over Berlin, one crisis only, that of Cyprus, has erupted inside the area of NATO jurisdiction which led to actual fighting and entailed the possibilities of wider conflict. In the Cyprus case, although all parties involved were members of NATO, it has not been NATO, but the U.N. which has taken the lead in mediating the conflict and dispatching a peace-keeping force to the troubled area. Outside the Atlantic and Mediterranean, situations continue to erupt which are of concern to the Alliance for the reasons that a civil war can

erupt into a general war and a change of regime may alter the balance of power within a geographical region. Suez, the Congo, and currently Vietnam, are vivid reminders of this truth.

The question, then, for NATO is whether the Alliance, as such, can concert its policies so as to present a common front in coping with situations of this kind—and a common front implies both diplomatic measures and, where necessary, military action planned and executed in concert. To do this involves two requirements at least. First, there must be preliminary discussion—leading, one hopes, to eventual agreement—about the conditions in which joint intervention by the NATO Allies would be appropriate and desirable outside of the NATO area. Since the circumstances in the particular cases are likely to vary so much, it is impossible to be entirely specific in advance of the event. However, agreement might be reached, in broad terms, about such situations in general. Second, it should then be possible to institute a standing machinery which would make immediate recommendations or decisions about what NATO should do whenever a dangerous state of affairs erupts.

If any such arrangements are to function satisfactorily, what is abundantly clear, is that there must be the fullest and frankest prior consultation among Allies if their consent is sought for joint action. NATO is not a super-State and does not have the political power to take decisions on behalf of the member-governments. (When, and if, that stage is ever attained, we would have reached the point of the political integration of the Atlantic Community. That may be ultimately desirable, but it is not the present actuality.) For the time being, granted that NATO is an Alliance of separate States, their governments are not going to write a "blank check" authorizing any one of their number, even the leading power of the group, to act on their behalf in unforeseen contingencies. The United States may justifiably hope to obtain support for joint action if procedures are employed for prior consultation and consent, but not taking unilateral measures for others to follow. This is the essence of partnership in a society of democratically-minded peoples.

Finally, it may be suggested that there are other possible spheres of action which would involve a departure from NATO's established role to date, but are simply a logical extension of its original and underlying concepts. This memorandum opened with the assertion that NATO was designed in the face of an immediate danger. True enough—but, it has always contained the seeds of a larger vision. That vision is, or should be, the dedication to the values of western civilization and a determination to safeguard and develop them both within the Atlantic region and wherever the Atlantic peoples can transmit their influence and culture. Thus far, NATO has limited itself to the military function, which it has conducted with success. But it is now time to pose squarely the question: Is the military role enough? Should not NATO begin to cultivate more fruits from the seed?

It could plausibly be argued that NATO needs at this time to acquire a new élan by deliberately launching itself into new activities which are not military and which will broaden the purposes of the Organization and deepen its meaning. If that argument holds up after examination, what could these activities be?

For a start, two may be suggested here. The NATO members, belonging for the most part to the most highly developed region in the world, have an obligation, as well as a selfish interest, to assist the more backward areas. NATO could consider the advisability of embarking on a program of economic aid and technical assistance to some of the less highly developed States in Africa, Asia and Latin America, and this would have the advantage of engrafting onto NATO and introducing into its politics the persons and organizations whose specialties lie in economic and technical development and in human welfare.

In addition, since homo Atlanticus has distinguished himself by the evolution of his ethical ideals, political institutions, and creative culture, NATO could well address itself to the animating spirit of the Atlantic peoples—i.e. the values which they share and have developed in common in Western Europe and North America. Consequently, it would be entirely appropriate for NATO, and wholly consonant with the larger vision which inspired its inception, for the Organization henceforth to initiate new programs for intellectual cooperation and for educational and cultural exchanges. While it is essential to maintain the defensive shield that protects the body politic of western civilization, it is no less important to nourish the spirit that accords the entire enterprise its raison d'être.

Mr. Speaker, our committee is indebted to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] for an analysis of the Lipson study. The gentleman is a member of our committee and also a member of the Committee on Public Works. I yield to Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Professor Lipson's paper is a perceptive and challenging exposition of the current state of NATO affairs. He thoughtfully points out that NATO's very success in carrying out the mission for which it was created—defense against Communist expansion—is perhaps the main reason for the present difficulties.

The nations of the Alliance, enjoying a breathing spell behind the NATO shield and, in a rather curious way, secure beneath the nuclear "balance of terror" between the United States and the Soviet Union, are freer to follow individual, nationalistic goals. The wreckage of war has been swept away, and, although many scars of war are forever engraved on the landscapes and in the souls of the people, prosperity has come. A new generation has risen, free from the wounds and bitter memories of war.

The Communist aggressor has been balked and now appears at least to direct his attention toward internal problems—and to the rising threats against himself from the Far East.

Conditions are changed from the founding days of NATO. The monolithic equipoise for international communism is gone for the moment, along with its one-time wholly Russian color. The threat to free nations is not lessened but it has changed.

It is time for a new look; for adaptations to new circumstances; for recasting the Atlantic structure to gain a better expression and effectuation of our common hopes and goals.

I hope that my colleagues will give it careful study and, with my distinguished colleagues on the NATO Task Force, I invite and welcome their constructive comment and observations.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the ninth and last of the Atlantic studies conducted by our committee. I trust these have been useful to the deliberation of the House on foreign policy. I yield back the remainder of my time.

HOW HYPOCRITICAL CAN THIS ADMINISTRATION GET?

Mr. SKUBITZ. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, how hypocritical can this administration get?

On September 12, the President sternly vetoed an overdue measure to increase life insurance coverage for Federal employees on the ground that the additional $90 million a year it would cost would be inflationary.

Then the President turned right around and put on the heat to pass a political $1¾ million poverty bill and followed that by demands to get going on a multi-billion-dollar demonstration cities program to federalize blockbusting in the suburbs of our metropolitan areas.

Civil service employees can draw their own conclusion. When it is a matter of elementary justice to them, it is inflation—but when it comes to massive vote-buying projects it is noble statemanship.

I repeat: How hypocritical can this administration get?

PLYMOUTH NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, 346 years ago the Pilgrims began their life in the new world at Plymouth, Mass. This brave group who ventured across the Atlantic to practice their religion in freedom symbolizes for many Americans and freedom-loving people throughout the world the spirit on which this Nation was founded. Thousands of people from all parts of this country and others visit this spot each year to spend an afternoon amid the charm and history of Plymouth.

I am therefore filing a bill today to establish a national memorial to commemorate the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock.

It is entirely fitting that the area around this famous rock be made a national memorial. Moreover, a move of this sort may soon become necessary. Plymouth, though it retains much of its colonial atmosphere, is a modern and growing town. The Rock and other points of interest are near its center and the town seems to be closing in. At the same time the number of tourists is increasing. This spot must be preserved now if it is to be enjoyed by future generations of Americans.

Early in 1963 I therefore, asked the park service to study the area to suggest possible plans for a memorial. They made a study and in June of this year

released a report, detailing three possible plans. As is my custom in matters of immediate concern to my constituents, I have waited to hear the reaction to the various proposals before taking any action.

The bill I am filing today reflects the views of those who will be closely associated with any national memorial as well as my own interest and theirs in seeing that Plymouth receive this long-merited national recognition.

My bill provides that no more than 15 acres may be taken for the memorial. I am hopeful that more specific details on the size and outlines of the park can be worked out as a result of committee hearings.

The bill also stipulates that no private homes may be destroyed or taken unless the land on which they are situated is essential to the development of the memorial. The proposed park area includes a few homes on the fringe. My bill would permit most of these to remain in private hands so long as owners conformed to zoning bylaws.

The outline of the park proposed by the National Park Service in their report includes at least one house which appears to have significant historic interest. It may be one of the oldest homes in the Nation. Since the park service report did not make any mention of this house, my bill provides that if the park service acquires any such property, it must maintain and preserve this as a part of the memorial.

In my view, it is essential that the Federal Government be kept highly aware of local needs, particularly when it moves into the heart of a town. Therefore the bill also provides for an advisory commission. This group would act as a liaison between the town and park service. In particular, it would be concerned with decisions to acquire property for the memorial, with standards for zoning bylaws—advising both town and park service on this—and with judging the importance of any historical property. In all these matters, it can act as interpreter between the town and park service.

It is my opinion that, under these circumstances, a national park could be established in a way that would serve our national interest and at the same time be of most benefit to the town of Plymouth.

The plan for this memorial, as set forth in my bill, is similar to the program for the development of the Cape Cod National Seashore. The seashore plan was the product of the joint efforts of Massachusetts two Senators, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, and John Kennedy, and myself. In that case we had a similar problem in that we were proposing a national park in a densely populated area. As the years go by, the system we worked out seems to be functioning smoothly. Hopefully we can have the same success with Plymouth.

It is important that we balance the needs of America for recreation areas and areas of natural beauty with the rights of individuals. It is possible to accommodate both if we make the effort.

"WE PROPOSE"—CLAREMONT (N.H.) EAGLE PRAISES GOP TASK FORCE FOR BOOK PROPOSING MODERNIZATION OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES

Mr. SKUBITZ. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Republican conference committee's task force on congressional reform and minority staffing, I am justifiably proud of the first fruits of our labor. This is a book, published September 30 by McGraw-Hill Co., entitled "We Propose: A Modern Congress." Containing articles by 21 Members and former Members of this body, it represents more than a year and a half of research, writing, rewriting, and editing. So far as I know it is the first book about Congress—a very much studied organization—to be written by a group of authors who have actually served in the House.

Most of the task force members presented their views in testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Some of our recommendations have been included in the bill the joint committee is proposing. Other points are made in the committee's final report and in the supplemental views, including those by the gentlemen from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HALL].

In our book, these proposals and comments are presented anew, in detailed and extended form. It is our intention and hope that the publication of "We Propose" will stimulate interest and discussion in the crucial problem of congressional reform. Although the book has not been out very long, there are already some encouraging responses. One of the best of these appeared in an editorial by Kenneth Whipple, editor of the Claremont Daily Eagle in my own district. I hope the interest shown in this thoughtful editorial will be taken up by editors and commentators throughout the land, spreading public interest and arousing public demand for reform across the country.

The Claremont Eagle has performed an outstanding public service in advancing the discussion thus far and I am happy to acknowledge its continuing contribution to good government through this editorial.

FOR A MORE MODERN CONGRESS

Serious students of government can find plenty of meat in a new volume of 338 tightly-packed pages, published this week by McGraw-Hill. Its title is "We Propose: A Modern Congress," and its proposals are broad and far-reaching indeed.

The average citizen, unfortunately, may not find or take time to study its details. Such neglect is indeed regrettable. For "We Propose" is a fascinating résumé of the work, procedures and problems faced by our elected representatives in safeguarding the public interest.

The book is made up of 21 articles by Members and former Members of Congress. These include selected proposals by the House Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing, of which our own New Hampshire Congressman, JAMES C. CLEVELAND of New London, is chairman.

Congressman CLEVELAND has based portions of his Washington Reports, from time to time, on the findings and progress of his committee. But the new volume goes far beyond this.

"We Propose" is divided into four major sections. The first, "The Committee Structure," has an article by CLEVELAND, "The Need for Increased Minority Staffing," whose arguments are familiar to his constituents.

Contributing to this section also are New York Mayor and ex-Congressman John V. Lindsay, Sen. GRIFFIN of Michigan, Congressman MORSE of Massachusetts. These experts discuss critically problems posed by the seniority system, by the composition and work of standing committees, and by overlapping jurisdiction.

"Policy-Making, Lobbying and Oversight" is the joint work of six Members of Congress. These experts take up congressional attitudes toward science policy, toward foreign policy, toward lobbying, and toward reforming budgetary and fiscal machinery.

A particularly pertinent contribution has been made here by Rep. ANCHER NELSEN of Minnesota, who decries "arm twisting" by the administration in all its forms as a means of securing passage by Congress of White House legislation.

Seven more congressmen continue their analysis of governmental shortcomings in a section titled "Toward More Efficiency and a Better Image." Reforms they propose include a new system of hiring youthful congressional pages; abandonment of the "spoils" system of hiring House employes; new rules for floor procedures; and installation of electric voting. And there's a lively and readable discussion titled "The Cost of Getting There and Length of Stay."

Fourth and final section of "We Propose" is perhaps its most controversial. In it members of the House argue the case for television and radio coverage, urged not only for the floor of the House but for committee sessions also; plus another oft-argued subject, the "captivity" of voteless Washingtonians, who after 80 years are still trying to gain self-government.

Another highly readable chapter is on "Operation of the Congressional Office." The writer here discusses the congressman's basic job (legislation); the diverse demands on his time, both from his constituents and otherwise; the amount of help he can have, and the amount he can pay.

A breakdown here shows that the average congressman, during an average five-day week, puts in a 12-hour day made up of (a) time on the floor of the House, (b) time on committee work, (c) time spent studying legislation, (d) time on constituent affairs, (e) time devoted to public statements and party functions.

A final chapter, by a 12-year veteran of Congress (Rep. Fred Schwengel of Iowa) urges modernization and improvement of the Legislative Reference Service (LRS) by means of automated information handling through Automated Data Processing (ADP) to replace behind-the-times methods which will grow even more outdated in the immediate future.

"We Propose" will, we fear, gain less readership that it deserves. But if it succeeds

in stirring public discussion on the role of today's Congress—and on its shortcomings—it will have made a meaningful contribution to the continuing experiment in American democracy.

K.D.W.

THE WORST 5 YEARS

Mr. SKUBITZ. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, a resigning high-level U.S. Department of Agriculture official has confirmed what this task force has pointed out time and again about the Johnson-Freeman administration's deliberate efforts to downgrade U.S. farmers for blatantly political reasons.

Mr. Frank M. LeRoux, former General Sales Manager for the Department of Agriculture's Foreign Agricultural Service, has termed the 1961–65 period covered by the Kennedy-Johnson administration as "the worst 5-year period for the American farmer in the history of modern American agriculture."

In his 64-page brochure entitled "1961 Through 1965—The Farmers' Worst 5 Years," Mr. LeRoux charges that the Agriculture Department and the administration have followed a course of depressing farm prices for political gain, and have made no effort to reach parity for farmers. This is exactly the state of affairs to which our task force has been calling attention for some time now, and Mr. LeRoux's analysis of the administration's destructive role in the field of Federal farm policy affords bipartisan confirmation of the incredible facts.

Mr. Speaker, this document sustains virtually everything the minority agriculture task force has revealed about the administration's agricultural policy in the numerous statements we have issued since our group was organized in early 1965.

Following are some typical examples of how Mr. LeRoux's findings substantiate those of the task force.

For instance, the task force has consistently denounced the administration's appalling plan to remove more than two-thirds of the Nation's farmers from the land. Mr. LeRoux says:

> If the minimum of gross sales be put at $10,000 as some in U.S.D.A. suggest, this will eliminate all but about one million farms (p. 59).
>
> If this becomes a reality, does this mean that all the small farm operators will no longer be considered as farmers and will be forced out of business? (p. 59).
>
> The American public would be much better off in many ways if the American farmer received an adequate return for his farming efforts and investment now. It would go a long way in stopping the exodus from the farm to the city and would save and maintain the family-sized farming unit (p. 58).
>
> How many of the social problems of the city have been brought about by the failure of the government to allow the farm economy to progress along with the other business segments of this prosperous nation? (p. 59).

The task force has said—on May 17, 1965:

> Nine million farm people, along with additional millions who provide the services for rural America, would become the "MiGrate Society" if the Administration should succeed in its plan to remove 2½ million farm families from the land.

On April 8, 1966:

> It is not difficult to understand why the farmers are leaving their fields, for the Johnson administration and Secretary Freeman have consistently pursued policies which have depressed the prices of farm commodities.

On April 8, 1966:

> The House Republican Task Force on Agriculture enthusiastically endorses the concept of reversing the migration (from the farms) and revitalizing rural America. As we pointed out last year, the decline of rural America is harmful to the entire Nation. But we cannot emphasize too strongly that the first and most important step in "rural revitalization" must be to allow the producers of food and fiber a fair return for their efforts. The Johnson Administration has it in its power to do something constructive for the farmer.

Time and again the task force has described with dismay the administration's deliberate attempts to depress farm prices and hold them at low levels. Mr. LeRoux says:

> While this Agricultural Administration was claiming the credit for the overall gains in Agricultural income it was at the same time trying to beat back the prices on the very commodities that were being used to base their claims of increased farm income (p. 32).
>
> Never before in agricultural history has a Secretary so frankly admitted the economic plight of the American farmer and at the same time be doing the unbelievable to destroy the farmers' opportunities to get a fair return for his efforts (p. 34).
>
> Why should the Farmers' own Secretary have made such an all out effort to break the price of meat? (p. 36).
>
> Commodity stocks could have been priced to raise market prices intsead of being used in the reverse manner—as they were to keep prices down (p. 38).

The task force has said—June 21, 1965:

> The House Republican Task Force on Agriculture has observed many examples of how the sale of Government-owned CCC stocks has become a gimmick for the purpose of artificially and arbitrarily depressing farm prices and lowering farm income.

On April 8, 1966:

> Secretary of Agriculture Freeman continues to use his authority to drive the prices of farm commodities downward.

On June 13, 1966, the task force spoke of the "deliberately planned" administration effort to break farm prices and drive them down through the "wholesale dumping of Government-owned corn and wheat, export controls on hides, slashes in Defense Department buying of butter, beef and pork, easing of import restrictions on sugar and Cheddar cheese and jawboning against food prices by the President himself."

The task force has often noted how the administration has turned its back on parity as an economic goal for agriculture. Mr. LeRoux's chart on page 43 of his brochure shows that for the last 5 years the parity ratio has averaged 78 percent, and that during the depression years 1933–40 the average was 81 percent. He says:

> During the greatest prosperity in the history of man, a record such as this 78 percent of parity could only have been accomplished through intent.

The task force has said—June 17, 1966:

> LANGEN pointed out that the parity ratio—a comparison of the prices farmers receive with those they pay—for the past five years has reflected an average 78 percent of parity. This is the lowest for any consecutive five year period since the depression days of the thirties.

The grossly inequitable economic position of American agriculture has also been a subject of continuing concern to the task force. Mr. LeRoux has said:

> Agriculture has shared but little in our startling national prosperity and the minute that the farmer has a chance to receive the least bit improvement, his prices are beaten back by one means or another and this has continued behind the scenes (p. 12).
>
> The farmer has received barely enough to offset his increased operational expenses (p. 12).
>
> The American farmer has not been put into the position of sharing in the prosperity of the times but rather he has been forced into the position of subsidizing the economy (p. 12).

The task force has said, on February 4, 1966:

> For instance, in spite of his key worldwide position, and in spite of the significance of his contribution to the strength of this Nation, the U.S. farmer is today faced with an economic situation which is both precarious and inequitable in comparison with the rest of the economy.
>
> Perhaps the most accurate indicator of the farmer's financial situation is the fact that his per capita disposable income averages little more than half that of the rest of the Nation.

Concerning the need for increased food production in the future and the question of prices to farmers, Mr. LeRoux says:

> Now is the time for the Government to reflect a fair price return to the farmer for his products so as to get the production necessary instead of the present policy of depressing prices (p. 63).

The task force has said, on July 26, 1966:

> Government grain dumping has depressed prices to farmers. Farmers must have assurance of a fair price for the additional food they are asked to produce. If they are asked to increase wheat and feed grain production in 1967, they should not also be asked to assume the entire risk of lower prices.

Regarding the fallacy of USDA "per farm" income statistics, Mr. LeRoux says:

> Why has the Secretary continued to make the average realized net income per farm his success story when this means nothing (p. 22).

The task force has said, on April 16, 1965:

> The per farm method of comparison is neither accurate nor valid.

The task force, in May of this year, sponsored the introduction of a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 635, in the House of Representatives, which called upon the administration to:

(1) Cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free-world prosperity.

There is still great need for this resolution which would require the administration to stop depressing farm prices. Only this week, Mr. LeRoux said:

Now is the time to decide if the apparent turn-about by the Secretary of Agriculture just before the election is sincere, and if the change of direction is in favor of the farmer. As of this date things have not changed. The same maneuvering against the farmers interests still goes on behind the scenes.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and the other members of the minority task force on agriculture, we recognize the great service Mr. LeRoux has performed to both American agriculture and the Nation in making public his candid analysis of present U.S. agricultural policy as expressed in his document entitled "The Farmers Worst 5 Years."

In conclusion, I just want to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House one more comment attributed to Mr. LeRoux at a news conference on Tuesday. When queried about Government statements that the farmer "never had it so good," he reportedly called them "absurd" and replied, "actually, he has never had it so bad."

REACHING FOR MORE POWER

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, in these days of increased Federal involvement in nearly every sector of public and private life, it is not surprising that another activity of private enterprise should be threatened by the reaching arms of the Federal bureaucracy. This time it is the recruitment and hiring of employees.

There is no doubt that the U.S. Employment Service could stand some improving, but the language of the Manpower Services Act of 1966, which is before my own Committee on Education and Labor, threatens to do much more than modernize and improve. It sets up mechanism to allow the Federal Government to recruit and place in different jobs those workers who are already employed. This is not the purpose of the Employment Service, which was set up to help those workers who are unemployed.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 18, 1966, which follows:

UNCLE SAM'S HIRING HALL

There is not much doubt that some functions of the U.S. Employment Service could stand improvement, but that doesn't mean it has to be radically altered in the way Congress is leaning.

In the area of job information, to mention one defect, the need is for more accurate and faster nationwide dissemination of information on job vacancies. As it is now, the swapping of job information from area to area depends largely on the cooperation of state employment services, which vary in efficiency.

Surely, however, this and other placement functions of the USES can be bettered without changing the essential nature of the Federal-state service. It was not intended, when the service was set up more than 30 years ago, that public funds be used to find new jobs for workers already employed.

And yet that is how such funds would be used under the Manpower Services Act of 1966, already passed by the Senate and now before a House committee. "The Congress declares," says the act's statement of purpose, "that a strong and modern manpower service system which operates not merely as a labor exchange . . . but as a comprehensive manpower services agency is essential . . ."

To make the service "comprehensive," the act would authorize the USES to do what lately it has been doing without authorization: To recruit for an employer a worker already employed by another. Put in blunt terms, the act would legalize Federal pirating of employes.

It is plain why private employment agencies are strongly opposed to this change in USES function. It could put them out of business—particularly if, as might happen in some period of declared manpower emergency, the Government made mandatory all job placement through its own service.

Less plain, perhaps, are the implications of the proposed change to employes. If the USES is empowered to move people about from one job to another, what is to prevent it from keeping them where they are if it so chooses? In other words, the act implies the sort of control over manpower which up to now, even in wartime, the Government has adopted only reluctantly.

A good many employers already have challenged the wisdom of giving the USES such broad controls over human beings. Certainly the concept of a centralized Federal hiring hall ought to be equally repugnant to employes, union and nonunion alike.

ARM TWISTING

Mr. SKUBITZ. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in this age of guidelines, the following guideline for public officers and employees might be useful for future reference:

LOBBYING WITH APPROPRIATED MONEYS

(Title 18, sec. 1913, USCA, pp. 118 and 119)

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment. June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 792.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and honor to serve for the last 4 years on the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission. I have greatly valued the experience of serving under Dean Sayre, the Chairman, and with the other distinguished members of the Commission.

During the course of our studies, we heard from many notable and knowledge men and women from every field. Each presented a different facet to the task of selecting a fitting memorial to the memory of President Wilson. I think it fair to say that every viewpoint was given comprehensive study and deep consideration.

From the many plans presented to the Commission, we settled on what has been called by former Justice Frankfurter the embodiment of an idea. We decided on a living memorial to the spirit and the ideas of Woodrow Wilson.

I am introducing legislation today to implement the recommendations of the Commission.

The structure will be located on Pennsylvania Avenue behind the National Archives. The memorial complex will consist of a number of buildings suited for scholarly pursuits, dominated by a sculpture which will be the embodiment of the idea of Woodrow Wilson.

The nearness of the National Archives and the Library of Congress relieve the need for any library facilities within the memorial complex. The buildings will simply provide a place for scholars to meet and study—a sanctuary where ideas can be exchanged and intellects interact. This should be a place where men can meet to ponder the place of the individual in the modern world. I would hope that this center would particularly draw the students of international relations and of law and world order.

The sculpture will dominate and permeate the entire memorial. I am hopeful that it will inspire the fresh visions so necessary to bring peace in our changing world. It should also serve to remind every visitor of the timeless yearning for world tranquillity that so constantly occupied the thoughts of President Wilson.

The sculpture should indeed be the embodiment of not only Woodrow Wilson the man, but also an expression of the ideas and spirit of Wilsonian democracy.

During President Wilson's trip to Europe to attend the Paris Peace Conference, President Wilson said in Manchester, England:

> There is only one thing that can bind people together and that is a common devotion to right. Ever since the history of liberty began men have talked about their rights, and it has taken several hundred years to make them perceive that the principal part of right is duty, and that unless a man performs his full duty he is entitled to no right.

This is the essence of Wilsonism—the appeal to common counsel and dynamic morals that cuts across national boundaries, and soars above individual selfishness. This was, and remains, the spirit of Wilson.

Perhaps no man better summed up Woodrow Wilson than Minority Floor Leader Finis James Garrett, of Tennessee, in remarks to the House the day after President Wilson's death:

> He walked upon heights untouched before by human foot; he sought to break new trails for mankind. Not alone in senates, parliaments, and chancelleries; not only in throne rooms and executive courts and cloisters was his idealism weighed and analyzed, but its spirit permeated the great masses of men, and from all the regions of earth in multifarious languages . . . came the plaudits of brain and heart and wistful souls.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot urge too strongly the acceptance of the concept of this memorial to such a great man, Woodrow Wilson.

Thank you.

ISLAND OF CYPRUS

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. POLANCO-ABREU] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, in August 1960 the island of Cyprus became an independent Republic. Today, 6 years later, finds the political status of that lovely island still a subject of controversy, involving not only the Cypriots themselves, but also at least two of our most trusted allies.

Democracy rests on the strength of two equally important pillars: majority rule and minority rights. If the majority fails to respect the rights of the minority, tyranny emerges. If the minority resists the will of the majority, anarchy and chaos prevail.

The people of Cyprus are engaged in a valiant struggle to establish democracy in their island. In pursuing this goal they have committed themselves in a declaration of intention and accompanying memorandum addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to protect and guarantee the rights and privileges of any minority group and individual members of said minority. The rights guaranteed to these minorities range from the use of their own languages in the courts and participation in Parliament, to the right to establish their own schools with financial support from the Government of the Republic. As an additional guarantee they are willing to accept, for a reasonable transitional period, the presence of a United Nations Commissioner to insure the protection of these rights.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, in Cyprus one of the two pillars stands solidly. Unfortunately, the other one does not. As a result of the series of international compromises leading to the establishment of the Republic, the right of the majority to rule was seriously curbed, and the door was left open for undue external interference in the internal affairs of Cyprus.

I am convinced that so serious have been these impediments, that the people of Cyprus, as a whole, have not had the opportunity to exercise their natural right of self-determination. These obstacles threaten to slow the pace of the Cypriots in their venture to provide a fuller life for all the people, and thus become an outstanding example to the world of democracies in development.

When these impediments have been removed, I am certain that Cyprus will prove how much a people, though small in numbers and geography, can accomplish through the democratic process and through the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination on the basis of the universally accepted principle of one man, one vote.

CONGRESSMAN PETER W. RODINO, JR., REPORTS ON THE RECORD OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, most authorities consider this the most productive Congress in our history. In the determined effort to forge a greater America and fashion a better life for every man, woman, and child, we have made notable progress, and it is a pleasure to report to the people of New Jersey's 10th District on the record of achievements of the 89th Congress to date.

This review must necessarily be confined to highlights, for in the nearly 18 years I have been privileged to serve in the House there has never been such a vast legislative record, or one to match such quality and substance.

My own efforts centered on my work as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, which in this Congress considered several of the most vital issues of our times. As assistant majority whip and a member of the steering committee, I participated in leadership decisions on legislative policies and programs. In the international area, I was again a delegate to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—ICEM—and the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, working on solutions to such problems as refugee resettlement, global hunger, and the security of NATO nations.

The programs enacted by this Congress are neither mysterious nor complicated. They add up to a decent job at decent pay, a decent home, and a decent education for every American; better cities, safer highways, cleaner air and water; a conscientious effort to end discrimination and uproot poverty, to help the elderly, and protect the consumer.

These programs recognize the importance of the human being. They elevate the worth of the individual. They celebrate the dignity of man.

The goal ahead is not a welfare state, but a state of well-being for all people—a state of well-being that is true to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, loyal to the wisdom of the Constitution, and faithful to the freedoms of the Bill of Rights.

Great forward strides have been taken, but there is still some distance to travel, and the path ahead may not always be smooth and not always clearly marked.

HUMAN RIGHTS

This Congress came to grips with two basic issues that had long been neglected, and this Congress successfully resolved them with the passage of legislation to assure the right to vote to all citizens and to end discriminatory practices in the admission of immigrants to this country. I was privileged to cosponsor the immigration reform bill and to write the majority report approving the voting rights bill. Enactment of these measures is vital to the fulfillment of the American ideal of equality for all.

Recognition also was given to the plight of Cuban refugees desiring permanent resident status and the problems of overhauling bail procedures in bills developed by the Judiciary Committee.

HUMAN NEEDS

Specific measures were passed to give special assistance to senior citizens, veterans, and those who have not had the benefit of education and employment opportunities.

For senior citizens, an Administration on Aging was approved to centralize all programs for the elderly, social security benefits were increased and expanded, and most important of all, the long struggle for medicare ended in victory. I was pleased to cosponsor and support these measures.

For disadvantaged citizens, the Job Corps, community action program, Headstart, and other antipoverty projects were extended and a rent supplement program authorized to break the cycle of poverty and give hope to those who have known only despair.

For veterans, the cold war GI bill will provide educational and housing benefits to post-Korean veterans. I was a cosponsor of the bill finally enacted. This Congress also authorized pay increases for military personnel and increases for veterans' pensions, improved health benefits for retired personnel, insurance and free mailing privileges for our men in Vietnam, and a number of other measures to assure a strong and safe America.

In the field of education, at all levels, the 89th Congress has compiled a magnificent record with programs of grants and assistance for construction, to help end the teacher shortage, to increase research facilities, and to provide financial aid to students.

In the field of health, in addition to medicare, this Congress approved the establishment of regional centers to combat the major killing diseases—heart, cancer, and stroke; expanded programs to wipe out polio and other infectious diseases; provided aid for medical students; and expanded the program for the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons.

Additionally, a bill for the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, which I cosponsored, has passed the House and is awaiting final approval in the Senate.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The challenge of maintaining a strong and healthy economy while providing fully for the conflict in Vietnam has been met by this Congress through the approval of checks and controls sought by the administration.

Important to our continued economic growth is the passage of legislation to increase the minimum wage and extend its coverage to additional workers, to adjust interest rates, and to authorize additional loan funds for home buyers.

Small business will benefit from legislation passed to improve and expand loan procedures and amounts.

In appraising legislation affecting the economy, I have given full consideration to the needs of labor and management in the belief that our continued prosperity is dependent upon fair and just treatment of both.

URBAN AFFAIRS

Because of the urban-suburban character of the 10th District, I will outline separately a number of measures of special importance to our area.

A measure which I cosponsored and strongly supported establishes the Department of Housing and Urban Development to deal specifically with the problems related to the growing urbanization of America, including mass transit, housing, renewal of slums, and the improvement of educational, economic, and social conditions of the people who live in slum areas.

The twin problem of water and air pollution has been of concern to me for years, and I have worked to develop effective control programs in the United States and at the international level through my participation in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. In this Congress we succeeded in extending the Clean Air Act to provide grants for air pollution control, a solid wastes disposal program, and a program for the elimination of pollution from motor vehicle exhausts. Legislation which I cosponsored was adopted to establish a Water Pollution Control Administration.

Other measures of importance to urban residents include the high-speed rail transportation program, extension of the highway system, and the traffic safety bill with its provision for Federal standards for all new cars.

CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Important natural resource and conservation measures were approved by this Congress, including efforts to increase water supplies in drought-parched areas like New Jersey through a Water Resources Commission, a desalinization program, and increased water research grants.

Of particular importance to New Jersey residents is the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, approved as part of the Tocks Island project. It will create a 37-mile-long body of water for boating, fishing, and swimming, while preserving thousands of acres of natural beauty for the enjoyment of hikers, campers, and picnickers.

Congress also acted to expand recreational facilities and fish and wildlife benefits in watershed areas and approved legislation which I introduced to preserve and develop the Hudson River.

INTERNATIONAL AREA

The conflict in Vietnam dominates the international scene. It is an agonizing situation, but until the Hanoi regime agrees to negotiate we must honor our commitment to protect Vietnam's independence. As chairman of a special subcommittee which investigated the refugee problem in Vietnam, I had the opportunity to talk personally with many of our fighting men there. Without exception, these young Americans expressed their strong belief in the cause for which they fight and in the necessity to continue the struggle until a just solution is achieved.

While we continue to explore every possible avenue to a peaceful settlement, we have not closed our eyes to the second struggle in Vietnam, the one against hunger, disease, and poverty. For this humanitarian purpose, Congress approved a supplementary aid program. We also extended the Peace Corps and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and provided emergency food aid for famine-suffering India.

WORK FOR THE 90TH CONGRESS

In the limited time remaining, it is doubtful that Congress will act on all of the meritorious legislation pending. I am concerned, for example, about the civil rights bill which I managed when it was before the House and which the House approved. Against a background of unrest, disturbances, and rioting that erupted in some areas of the country, the Senate failed to act on this measure. I abhor the violence and looting of unlawful mobs on the loose. Under no circumstances can such actions be condoned. We must keep in mind, however, that the rioting and disturbances are the handiwork of a handful of brash and irresponsible extremists, and that millions of Negro citizens should not be made to suffer because of the rashness of the few troublemakers. We need calm and tranquillity, and we need good laws to generate respect for the law. The civil rights bill will make a good law and will contribute importantly to the easing of racial tensions. The situation, however, is so urgent that I have introduced the antiriot provisions of the bill as separate legislation. The terror and havoc which have destroyed the peace in various communities must be halted. At hearings today I urged speedy approval of this measure, for I believe its enactment will help to make it possible for voices of reason to prevail.

Another pending bill with which I am concerned is one to limit the powers of States to tax interstate commerce. This measure, developed after 4 years of study by a special Judiciary Subcommittee of which I am a member, will be of particular help to business, large and small.

Despite the lack of final action on these and other important bills, it is evident that the record of the 89th Congress has more than justified President Johnson's description of it as "the greatest outpouring of creative legislation in the history of the Nation."

In determining my position on this legislation, I have—as always—given full consideration to the views of all residents of the 10th District, regardless of political affiliations. It is only natural that in a district as diverse and populous as the 10th District the residents will hold to varying shades of opinion on the many bills involved. I respect the views of each individual and consider them fully and fairly. In the final analysis I have taken my stand on the basis of what, in deference to all of these opinions, I believe is in the best interests of the people of the 10th District and the Nation.

During the nearly 2 years of the 89th Congress, I might point out, my office has received more than 100,000 pieces of mail from 10th District residents, expressing their opinions on pending legislation, seeking information, or requesting assistance in connection with problems involving governmental agencies.

Every letter, every postcard, was given careful attention, and every problem, no matter how big or small, where I could properly be of help, was followed up quickly and diligently.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to represent New Jersey's 10th District in the 90th Congress, and I extend, through this report,

my offer to assist those who need help. As in the past, I welcome the views of all 10th District residents and the opportunity to be of service to them.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE JEWISH COMMUNITY

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of misinformation published recently concerning some remarks attributed to President Johnson with respect to this Government's support of Israel and the alleged relationship of that support to the attitude of the Jewish community toward administration policy in Vietnam.

There is no question that the overwhelming majority of lay opinion in the Jewish community supports President Johnson's policy in honoring our commitment to the people of South Vietnam and there is no question but that we could not be asked to keep our commitment to Israel and violate the same commitment to South Vietnam.

To clarify this matter even further, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement issued September 12, 1966, by Dr. William A. Wexler, president of B'nai B'rith:

B'nai B'rith places little credence in the validity of the statements attributed to President Johnson in which the Administration's support of and aid to Israel was equated with a presumed attitude of the American Jewish community toward the war in Viet Nam.

We also find no reason to accept as substantive the publicized statements which interpreted the President as having expressed a near-blanket indictment of Jewish organizations for a supposed view on the Viet Nam issue.

Rabbi Jay Kaufman, executive vice president of B'nai B'rith, and I met with the President Saturday evening. [Sep. 10]

It is our belief that the President's views were either misunderstood or poorly interpreted to the news media.

It is evident to us that the views attributed to the President conveyed neither his attitude nor his convictions.

The inference of an interrelationship between future American-Israeli affairs and support among Jewish organizations for Administration policies in Viet Nam appears to us to have been as inaccurate as it was unfortunate.

It was an inference wholly inconsistent with Mr. Johnson's long-standing views regarding United States relations with Israel. His record, dating back to his service as Senator and Majority Leader, has been consistently predicated on a spirit of friendship and mutuality between the two nations; his actions, consonant with our national interest in reducing political tensions and the threat of war in the Middle East, have been productive.

Implicit in the publicized statements was a contention that most Jewish organizations do not support United States policy in Viet Nam.

There is no real basis for such an inference.

In the view of B'nai B'rith, it is inaccurate to speak of a distinctly Jewish viewpoint on Viet Nam.

There is none as such.

The fact is: most Jewish organizations have adopted no formal views or policies on Viet Nam.

Among those that have, only a few have taken a pro or con position on the opposing views of American escalation of or withdrawal from the war. Even here, there exist strong differences of opinion within the constituencies of these organizations.

B'nai B'rith supports the principle of the right of small nations to the integrity of their independence and to pursue their own destiny.

We believe that the major powers have a moral responsibility to preserve that integrity and freedom, and we are concerned—as we understand the President to be—that a neo-isolationist mood can threaten to negate this principle.

The differing viewpoints and the absence of definitive positions by most Jewish groups appear to us to demonstrate an ambivalence among American Jews that is parallel with and a part of the uncertainties and division of thought and attitude evident in the Congress, the religious community, other elements of our society and the citizenry as a whole.

Jewish organizations have been nearly unanimous on a single, corollary aspect of the Viet Nam crisis—the right of and need for those who disagree with Administration policy to express their dissent freely and, of equal importance, responsibility.

Support of this basic American principle was demonstrated at the National Community Relations Advisory Council meeting in Washington in June. The resolution subscribed to by the participating Jewish groups affirmatively supported and quoted President Johnson's expressed view that "No American, young or old, must ever be denied the right to dissent. No minority must be muzzled. Opinion and protest are the life breath of democracy—even when it blows heavy."

It is regrettable that this resolution has been, at times, misinterpreted or distorted to simply a Jewish viewpoint on the Viet Nam issue itself.

The resolution dealt singularly and exclusively with the right of dissent. It did not in any way express either adverse judgment or endorsement of Administration policy in Viet Nam.

BANK MERGER ACT

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I have noted the recent statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] regarding the Bank Merger Act of 1966.

I am pleased that he has brought statements of our fellow colleagues to my attention, so that this matter might be put in the proper perspective. We can only look to the statements of this body prior to the passage of the act in determining what was the intent of Congress. At that time this issue was freshest in all our minds. At that time we were most intensively immersed in the matter. At that time the statements that were made regarding the intent and meaning of the act were representations to one's fellow colleagues, made solemnly on the floor of this body. At that time each Member had the opportunity to examine and question one's colleagues, should any doubt have existed in a single mind as to the meaning of the bill that we were considering. At that time any Member might object if he heard any idea or interpretation that he considered in error, so that the official debate would be officially correct in everyone's mind.

In that atmosphere of examination and debate, the meaning of a piece of legislation emerges. The value of unilateral statements, composed long after the fact, not open to the questioning and thorough examination of debate, has no value whatsoever in determining the legislative intent of an act.

Men may reconsider their views. Men may forget. Men may change their positions with time.

Quite rightly, we must examine the actual words of the Members of this body if we are to determine the congressional intent of the Bank Merger Act of 1966.

This was primarily an act composed in this body. The committee of which I am privileged to be a member radically changed the bill that it received. For better or worse, this body and the House Banking and Currency Committee are officially the authors of the Bank Merger Act of 1966.

There appears to be confusion about the interpretation of the act, and unfortunately my statement in the report on the bill may prove all too accurate—House Report 1221, 89th Congress, 2d session, January 24, 1966, pages 35–36:

Although it is my understanding that the bill leaves the antitrust laws intact, it will be argued by any future beneficiary of an anti-competitive merger that the bill intends to eviscerate the antitrust laws: Accordingly, the intent of Congress, . . . will probably require definition by the Supreme Court. Until that time, we will not know the meaning of what we have written.

The majority reports states: "(1) The bill would establish a single set of standards for the consideration of future mergers * * * under the antitrust laws * * *", and in the section 2(d) H.R. 12173 defines the antitrust laws as those now in existance. Thus, there is a clear implication that the antitrust provisions have not been changed.

It is my hope that an examination of the debate on the floor will clearly resolve the meaning of the act. If confusion persists among those who have large financial interests in proving otherwise, I have little doubt that the courts of the Nation will correctly see the legislative history in its proper perspective.

The debate on February 8, 1966, on the act was long and regarded many, many facets of a highly complex subject.

One thing however, comes through from it all loud and clear, and that is that the antitrust laws under the standards enunciated in the 1966 act apply to banks with equal if not more force than before. The basic concept emerges, time and again, during the course of debate, that competition is the prime factor to be considered in bank mergers. Bank factors, to be sure, have their part

in the weighing-in processes of a bank merger, but competition is preeminent. The act stands for legislative reaffirmation of the Philadelphia case. It gives added strength to the holding in that case.

I quote from my statement in the committee report, No. 1221, on the bill:

The committee is fully cognizant, as a consequence of the hearings, of the interpretation of the "public interest" as enunciated by the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia case:

"It therefore proscribed anticompetitive mergers, the benign and the malignant alike, fully aware, we must assume, that some price might have to be paid. * * *

The fact that banking is a highly regulated industry critical to the Nation's welfare makes the play of competition not less important but more so. At the price of some repetition, we note that if the businessman is denied credit because his banking alternatives have been eliminated by mergers, the whole edifice of an entrepreneurial system is threatened; if the costs of banking services and credit are allowed to become excessive by the absence of competitive pressures, virtually all costs, in our credit economy, will be affected; and unless competition is allowed to fulfill its role as an economic regulator in the banking industry, the result may well be even more governmental regulation. Subject to narrow qualifications, it is surely the case that competition is our fundamental national economic policy, offering as it does the only alternative to the cartelization or governmental regimentation of large portions of the economy."

However, this is not what one person believes. Others told their fellow colleagues their interpretation of the act prior to our voting on it. It is with their uncontradicted and uninterrupted statements on the floor at that time with which I agree. As the distinguished and knowledgeable chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee stated on February 8, 1966, at page 2441 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

This bill, in contrast [to the seven factors of the Bank Merger Act of 1960], makes the competitive factor pre-eminent. And the competitive standard to be applied is clearly that of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. In fact the language of paragraph 5 of the bill is taken directly from the language of sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act and section 7 of the Clayton Act, and intentionally so.

* * * * *

I would like to emphasize again that, as far as the bank supervisory agencies are concerned, the standard established under this bill is a stricter standard for approving mergers than that in the 1960 Act. Under this legislation competition is pre-eminent. Under the 1960 Act competition was only one of seven factors to be considered by the bank supervisory agencies.

After the remarks of the chairman of the committee, then the ranking member of the other party, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] rose and continued to explain the bill to the members present—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2442:

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the bill has been explained sufficiently by the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] quite fully as to the context of the bill.

* * * * *

H.R. 12173 does not attempt to make bank mergers easier by rewriting the antitrust laws.

Thus the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] agreed on this very fundamental issue.

Other knowledgeable members of the Banking and Currency Committee agreed with the above statements during the course of the debate:

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] stated—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2446:

Briefly summarized, H.R. 12173 would establish a single set of standards for the consideration of future mergers by the banking supervisory agencies, the Department of Justice, and the courts under the antitrust laws—standards stricter than those in the Bank Merger Act, but which include both the effect of the merger on competition and the convenience and needs of the community to be served.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] reinforced this position with his speech—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2448:

In the bill which is before us, we do not go as far as the Supreme Court did in minimizing the antitrust factors. We do not merely say that the merger must be "consistent with the public interest" as the Court said. We gave greater weight to the antitrust factors by providing that the merger cannot be approved unless, "the anticompetitive effects of the proposed transaction are clearly outweighed in the public interest."

The gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] further reinforced the interpretation of the bill before us during that debate when he stated—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2456:

It preserves intact section 2 of the Sherman Act as applied to banks and weighs other antitrust laws against the convenience and needs of the community keeping anticompetitive factors predominant. Those who say that it has the effect of repealing the antitrust laws as applied to banks are misleading their colleagues.

The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH], in analyzing the bill, declared—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2451:

This bill established competition as the primary factor in determining whether a bank merger shall be approved by the appropriate bank supervisory agency.

During the course of the debate on the floor, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], both lawyers of vast experience in their own right, examined the exact impact, if any, that the Bank Merger Act of 1966 would have on the factor of competition:

Mr. WELTNER. If the gentleman will hold a moment, let us assume that we have a bank merger which tends to create a monopoly. I should like to ask the gentleman if he can suggest to me some circumstances involving the convenience and needs of the community where the tendency to create a monopoly may be clearly outweighed in the public interest by the probable effect of that proposed transaction on meeting the convenience and needs of the community to be served.

Mr. REUSS. I will be very glad to do so. Take a community with two banks. One of those banks is failing. In such a situation, even though the absorption of the failing bank will create in the community thereafter one bank, a monopoly, I think that that might well be upheld as a merger which would meet the convenience and needs of the community. Indeed, I remind the gentleman from Georgia that under existing antitrust law such a merger would be valid. I reiterate my contention that we are not here today in any way tampering with the existing enlightened interpretation of the antitrust laws.

Mr. WELTNER. Is the gentleman saying that this legislation does not affect the antitrust laws as they are written and presently interpreted by the Court, to wit, in the Philadelphia case of June 1963?

Mr. REUSS. I am so saying. I think under this law, as amended, a court could very well come to precisely the same conclusion as the Court did in the Philadelphia case, holding that the 30-percent concentration inherent in the merger sought in that case was not overweighed by the convenience and needs of the community.

Mr. WELTNER. The gentleman's response is encouraging. As one of the chief architects of this bill, his interpretation is helpful to me as one concerned about the application of the antitrust laws.

It is important to note that not only did these two gentlemen agree that the antitrust laws were not in any way affected by the Bank Merger Act of 1966, but that they also defined the phrase "convenience and needs of the community" as applying to failing banks. These are the shotgun mergers, which have always been recognized as standing in a unique relationship to the antitrust laws.

Indeed, this removed entirely the ambiguity surrounding the phrase "convenience and needs of the community." It places in phrase in the proper context of previous legislation, designed to protect the community from failing banks. Special timetables exist for mergers involving failing banks. This is a unique distinction, and we recognized it as such.

The distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI], in expressing his analysis of the bill, stated during the debate the following—RECORD, page 2462:

The bill would establish a single set of standards for the consideration of future mergers by the banking supervisory agencies, the Department of Justice, and the courts under the antitrust laws. These standards are stricter than those in the Bank Merger Act [of 1960].

During the debate on the floor the honorable and perceptive gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] asked me on the floor to clarify these impressions of the pending bill—RECORD, page 2457:

Mr. TODD. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WELTNER. Would the gentleman from Michigan agree that in determining what is in the public interest in meeting the needs and convenience of the community to be served, it would be important to consider as

probably primary among those factors, the free and open competition between banks unfettered by contracts or agreements in restraint of trade, undiminished by monopolies, and without being strictured by the creation of economic units intended to stifle free and open competition?

Mr. TODD. I think that the gentleman from Georgia states it very well . . .

The Supreme Court has said exactly what the gentleman from Georgia said in defining public interest. The public interest is the preservation of competition.

All of the Members who are concerned about the meaning of the bill before the House on February 8, 1966, were present. All heard the above words, excerpts of the debate. When the vote came, the Members understood that they were voting on a bill whose meaning has just been documented above.

Men may change their minds after an event, and have doubts about the wisdom of their previous actions. They may question the wisdom of a bill after it has been fought over, debated, and passed. But none may doubt the meaning of the Bank Merger Act of 1966. It retains and indeed strengthens the antitrust laws. The importance of the anticompetitive factor cannot be overemphasized. With the full knowledge of the Philadelphia decision, this body chose to legislate a bill that would reaffirm that competition is a primary consideration when evaluating a bank merger.

The above is legislative history of the act under discussion.

Four months after the passage of the Bank Merger Act of 1966, the Comptroller of the Currency appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee to discuss H.R. 14026, a bill that would restore sound competition for savings and time deposits. On May 31, 1966, the Comptroller of the Currency and I discussed the relationship of competition and the public interest, and were able to come to agreement. It was gratifying that the Comptroller further substantiated and reaffirmed to my mind the position that I have demonstrated here today in this speech.

As the Comptroller and I differed on many matters during consideration of the Bank Merger Act Amendments of 1966, and as his lawyers undoubtedly will be arguing against the views stated in this speech in future cases, it was good to have had an opportunity, away from the sound and the fury of formal debate, to discuss the meaning of this matter and agree on it as two individuals, unburdened by one's immediate interests that require consideration and protection.

The dialog follows—"To Eliminate Unsound Competition for Savings and Time Deposits," hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 2d session, on H.R. 14026, pages 278–280:

Mr. TODD. Then would I be correct in believing that you feel the broad public interest is promoted by competition, and that it clearly outweighs our traditional means of regulating the interest rate ceilings, that the promotion of competition——

Mr. SAXON. The answer is yes, the most efficient mechanism of allocating resources to their most effective use in the economy. I do not know how the Government can perform this function as efficiently. We talk about the housing industry. We project x starts. Now who can profess to say what the starts should be outside of the normal demand generated throughout the country and reflected in terms of the market forces.

Mr. TODD. So that the role of the regulatory agency then would be one of promoting financial soundness, but at the same time promoting competition between the various agencies which are being regulated, and this would be the primary public interest consideration of the agency.

Mr. SAXON. That competition ought to exist among all of the financial businesses generally.

Mr. TODD. Well then, would you feel that if the regulations were issued by a regulatory agency which had some anticompetitive effect, that this would have to be, if it were to be in the public interest, it would have to be addressed to the financial stability of the institution? In other words, the only reason for issuing a regulation which is anticompetitive would be one which would effect the financial soundness of the institution.

Mr. SAXON. I think this is correct.

Mr. TODD. The reason I bring this up . . . is we were to a certain extent on different sides of the Bank Merger Bill, but I think we both, based on this colloquy, believe that competition is the primary function of a regulatory agency and there is a primary public interest involved in financial institutions, would that not be correct?

Mr. SAXON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TODD. Fine . . .

With the agreement of the Comptroller of the Currency that competition is the primary part of the public inerest, there can be no question as to the interpretation of this matter. The maintenance and strengthening of open and free competition is the major and overriding public policy consideration in this field. All other factors must be subordinate to it.

On this there seems to be complete agreement, if one looks to facts. I am certain that no one would want to do otherwise.

DOMINICAN FORCE WITHDRAWN

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, we can all rejoice in the fact that the last units of the Inter-American Peace Force have been withdrawn from the Dominican Republic.

The new government of President Joaquin Balaguer deserves much credit for achieving the political stability and order which makes this withdrawal possible. But, as noted in the Houston Post, substantial credit also must go to President Johnson. Bloody civil strife or Communist domination might have been the legacy of inaction at the moment of difficult decision.

Hard decisions cannot wait, though their assessment must. It is gratifying to take cognizance of one hard decision that has been proved correct in the perspective of time.

I place in the RECORD the entire editorial as it appeared in the Houston Post:

[From the Houston Post, Sept. 21, 1966]

DOMINICAN FORCE WITHDRAWN

Nobody ever was very happy over the necessity for outside intervention in the affairs of the Dominican Republic, least of all the United States, so there can be nothing but satisfaction over the fact that the last units of the Inter-American Peace Force have been withdrawn.

It is a tribute to the new government of President Joaquin Balaguer that sufficient progress has been made toward restoring order and political stability to permit the withdrawal, after only 17 months. But most of the credit should go to the Dominican people themselves for their rejection of extremism of both the right and the left when given an opportunity to express themselves.

It would be naive to believe, or even hope, that complete tranquillity is going to prevail in the country in the foreseeable future. Formidable economic problems remain to be solved. Only a start has been made, and until they are solved, they will nourish the roots of unrest. Moreover, the extremist elements that were responsible for plunging the country into bloody chaos or that undertook to exploit the situation remain on the scene and can be counted upon to take advantage of every opportunity for creating trouble that presents itself.

There were rumors recently of a coup against the newly elected government. This might have had the effect of delaying withdrawal of the inter-American troops, but the talk died down. It appears that the government of President Balaguer has the internal situation fairly well in hand and is headed down the right road. It is to be expected that there will be sporadic violence and bloodshed, but hopefully it will not be on a large scale.

Withdrawal of the inter-American force robs the Communists of their favorite propaganda theme. For all the shouting of Yankee-go-home slogans, this was the last thing that the leftwing extremists really wanted. It was inevitable that there should be some resentment among the Dominican people against outside intervention, and particularly against the United States. The left-wingers exploited these emotions fully.

President Johnson and his administration have been criticized sharply in some quarters for having initiated the Dominican intervention, but they can look back with considerable satisfaction upon events of the past 17 months. Except for the firm, positive and swift action taken by the United States, it is highly improbable that things would have worked out as they did. Indeed, it is quite possible that the Dominican Republic today would be under Communist control or still engaged in bloody civil strife.

Although the Dominican people and their moderate leaders deserve most of the credit for the progress that the country has made in recent months, this progress hardly would have been possible without help and guidance from Washington. From the standpoint of President Johnson, the Dominican episode must be regarded as much more of a feather in his cap than a black eye.

At the same time, probably nobody is happier about the fact that withdrawal of the last inter-American units was possible. Their presence, no matter how necessary, continued to be a thorn in inter-American relations. This thorn would have become increasingly painful if the troops had remained

any longer than there was a clear, definite and demonstrable need for them to remain.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY: AN INVITE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recently I conducted a seminar on the problems of unemployment in my home district of San Antonio, Tex. Among the participants were representatives of the business and community leadership. In connection with the seminar I stated that it was vital to the future growth of San Antonio that there be full commercial and industrial growth as well as maximum use of the available Federal, State, and local programs. Apparently, the John Birch Society was intrigued by my reference to the private sector, and as a result of my statement I received yesterday an invitation to join that organization.

For the interest and enlightenment of my colleagues in the House, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of the unusual invitation from the John Birch Society along with my reply. I hope to keep the House further informed.

OCTOBER 3, 1966.

Hon. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Twentieth Congressional District of Texas,
Federal Building,
San Antonio, Tex.

DEAR MR. GONZALEZ: Enclosed is an application for membership to the John Birch Society. This application is tendered to you in view of your recent apparent conversion to Conservatism. Published comments by you, as they appeared in the local newspapers of September 13th and 14th, indicating strong concern for the dangers of government paternalism over the economy of this nation, is truly a conservative attitude. Holding to this concern it is only natural to assume that you will direct your future efforts to the idea of "Less Government" which is the John Birch Society's approach to the securing of more freedom for all.

In addition, since it is impossible to embrace two opposing positions at the same time, your strong stand for and support of all the Conservative candidates of your Party, has been a definite repudiation of your former Liberal supporters. Since TRUTH is the weapon of the John Birch Society we salute you in taking a definite stand befitting your position of leadership.

You have recently in articles published in all newspapers blasted the Administration and the Defense department policies for not curtailing defense contractor's profits and have claimed "despite the threat of inflation profits for contractors have zoomed right along." This, of course, would tend to support the idea that this war is an economic one and that the idea of communism vs americanism is only secondary. It is timely that you present this question just before an election, because there are many thinking people, not only members of the John Birch Society, that have drawn this same conclusion.

We applaud what is apparently your rejection of the doctrinaire Liberalism and feel that your courage in accepting the true worth of the conservatives in your Party will contribute much to our cause, which is the conservation of our form of government as prescribed by the founding fathers.

Whether you decide to take advantage of this application at this time or not, we want to assure you that you should feel free to call upon us for information of most reliable and detailed nature, which will be made available to you according to your need.

It would only be fair, but probably not necessary, to premise the acceptance of your application on your rejection as a congressman, the idea of the "Father idea" of a paternal government and accepting the idea that each citizen should accept more individual responsibility making possible less government thus allowing more freedom, creating a better USA and a better World.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES W. JOHNSON, M.D.,
Member, John Birch Society.
BARD A. LOGAN,
Member, John Birch Society and Conservative Party Candidate for Governor.

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP

———, 19—.

The JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY,
Belmont, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: This is my application for membership in the ——— Chapter of the John Birch Society, for one year from this date, and for automatic renewal each year thereafter, unless I resign in writing. I understand the dues schedule printed on the back of this sheet as applicable to myself.

If my application is accepted, I agree that my membership may be revoked at anytime, by a duly appointed officer of the Society, without the reason being stated, on refund of the pro rata part of my dues paid in advance.

Sincerely,
(Name) _____
(Address) _____
_____
Date _____
Dues Received _____
Application Approved By _____
Title _____

DUES SCHEDULE

Life membership in the home chapter (which automatically covers membership in any local chapter), for men or women (this may be paid in two consecutive annual installments of $500 each)	$1,000
Regular annual membership in the home chapter (this is paid annually to the home office):	
For men	24
For women	12
Membership in local chapter, minimum per year (this may be paid as $2 per month for men, and $1 per month for women, to the local chapter leader):	
For men	24
For women	12

If any member wishes to pay larger dues, to support the Society's work (or to make contributions for that purpose), such dues or contributions may also be split into monthly installments if desired.

(Applications for membership in local chapters should be approved by the Chapter Leader. Applications for membership in the Home Chapter will be approved by the home office.)

OCTOBER 5, 1966.

Dr. CHAS W. JOHNSON and Mr. BARD A. LOGAN,
San Antonio, Tex.

DEAR DR. JOHNSON AND MR. LOGAN: Thank you for your invitation to the John Birch Society.

It is gratifying to know that some of my speeches have now reached the level of consciousness of the John Birch Society leadership in San Antonio. As a matter of fact, you would find, if you checked the record and some of my earlier speeches, that for years I have been urging the community and business leaders to place greater emphasis on greater commercial and industrial development of our city. The failure of the private sector to realize its potential is a serious limitation on the future growth of San Antonio. At the same time, the Federal government has played an important and constructive role in our area, and will continue to do so. The achievement of both full industrial and commercial development, and of maximum use of the available Federal, State and local programs, is in the public interest and is the challenge which faces San Antonio.

Before responding to your invitation, I wonder whether you can provide me with some information about your organization. I would like to see a copy of your constitution and bylaws and whatever literature you can send to explain the goals and purposes of the JBS, its organization and structure, and eligibility and requirements of membership. I would also like to know something about the membership. How many members of the JBS are there in San Antonio, and what are their names? Who are the officers of the San Antonio branch? What is your relationship to the national JBS? Are any other groups subsidiaries or in any way affiliated with the JBS, such as the Minutemen? Is the John Birch Society a political organization, or does it consider itself a non-profit or educational organization? What can you tell me about the activities of the JBS in Texas and in the San Antonio area?

As soon as I receive this information and have a chance to study it, I will be in a better position to evaluate your invitation.

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,
HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

POLISH BISHOP SPEAKS AT ST. PATRICK'S CATHEDRAL

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 25, His Excellency Bishop Wladyslaw Rubin, auxiliary to Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland, delivered the sermon at a mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York marking the observance of Poland's millennium. The sermon, as reprinted in the September 28 edition of Nowy Swiat, the Polish Morning World, follows:

We are gathered here today to commemorate the one thousandth anniversary of Poland's Baptism. With our celebration, we are entering in a great current of prayers flowing throughout the Universal Church, to honor God and to thank Him for the gift of faith which the Polish nation received a thousand years ago.

It is obvious, that for celebrating such a great event, the Polish nation first of all unites in prayerful assemblies.

The Polish people manifested their feelings for the Church in many ways and especially in the participation of the observances which are taking place throughout the country in these last few months. However, many of Poland's Millennium celebrations encountered difficulties, obstacles and harassments; and yet, her people keep their faith in God and remain faithful to the Church and the pastors.

It was not only the Polish nation who wanted to celebrate this event, but many fellow Christians and brothers in Christ throughout the world were anxious to join the Catholics in Poland in their joy and to unite with the Polish nation in prayer and sacrifice.

Above all the Holy Father, Pope Paul VI has shown great interest and enthusiasm for the Millennium celebration in Poland. Therefore the Church in Poland wanted to give her children the greatest possible joy: the presence of the common Father of all Catholics, Pope Paul VI, at the thanksgiving services in Czestochowa. For that reason, Cardinal Wyszynski appealed to the government in his own and in the name of the Polish Bishops to allow the Holy Father's visit. The Cardinal knew how much good it would add to the prestige of the country, and how easily it would help maintain peace in the land. The government's refusal wounded the feelings of the Poles for all the grief it caused the Holy Father, whom they love and for throwing away a splendid opportunity for good.

Since the Polish government would not allow the Holy Father to participate in the ceremonies at Jasna Góra. He offered the Mass in the Chapel of Our Lady of Czestochwa beneath Saint Peter's Basilica at the very same time when the celebrations were going on in Poland. A few days later, on May 15, before a crowd of thousands of Poles living abroad who came to Rome, the Holy Father celebrated Mass at Saint Peter's Basilica to commemorate the Millennium. In his sermon, the Holy Father refuted the government's claim that the Millennium was a political maneuver of the Polish Hierarchy. He went on to say that the faith shown during the Millennium celebration serves well for Poland's future as a modern advancing nation.

The Church in Poland wishes just to fulfill that mission working so that the nation would remain Christian, so that it would not lose its faith. Therefore the Church in Poland wishes to actualize the ecumenical renewal of spirit in every segment of its spiritual life and in every field of human endeavor. No one more than the Church of Poland demands that the Conciliar Constitutions, decrees and declarations be put into practice. All of the documents would be of great benefit to the Church in Poland. But the Church in Poland cannot put them into practice, because the Church in Poland is often denied the possibility of introducing fully the decrees due to restrictions and harassments imposed on her activities. In this ecumenical renewal Stefan Wyszynski plays the most important role. The Pope John XXIII, great friend of the Polish people, at an audience for the Poles on November 19, 1958, acclaimed Cardinal Wyszynski as the Shepherd of the highest virtue who brings honor and glory to his nation and the Church. "Under his leadership", said the saintly Pope John XXIII, and under that of all your Shepherds . . . the Polish Catholics shall not falter." It was as though he had a premonition that there will be those who will use his great and good Person of the Good Shepherd to evil ends in their struggle with the Church; he said: "Let no one allow himself to be seduced by those movements that appear under the label 'Catholic' but are not its true expression" Pope John warned us against such Catholics who take separate thought out of the context of his teaching to fight the Church, especially if that thought had been wrongly interpreted. Those people never mention that Pope John demanded freedom for his oppressed Church. In his encyclical, "Pacem in terris" he defines the conditions of coexistence. He stresses that coexistence will be possible if the basic natural rights of the human person are respected in the State, in international relations, and in the family. These are the rights to truth, freedom, justice, mutual respect and love. The Catholic Church in Poland has called on the State for laws which recognize her as a legally existing public body. She demands the right to establish religious groups, sodalities, brotherhoods of Christian mercy, schools, hospitals, social centers to use instruments of social communication such as the press, radio and television. The Church in Poland does not ask for privileges, she merely asks to be treated in the same manner as are treated the unbelievers.

Man today wants full religious freedom and respect for his beliefs. He will not impose his beliefs upon others, but he is entitled to hold and openly profess his beliefs. No one has the right to oppose the faith of others. No civil authority has the right to interfere with citizen's beliefs or to try to change them by pressure. Though the authorities have the right to prepare citizens for modern life, and therefore to set certain educational standards, they cannot require people to abandon their God. "Peaceful coexistence within a particular country means respect for every citizen in every situation."

The Church in Poland follows the line of the Vatican Council and walks in the footsteps of Popes, John XXIII and Paul VI. Such is the meaning, the sense, and the character of the Millennium observance in Poland. The Church in Poland desires to build bridges between people, to reconcile everybody, extending a friendly hand to all. We are confident that the spirit of love and forgiveness, so strikingly present in the observances and celebrations in Poland, will bring freedom to the Church, the freedom for which the nation prayed by offering itself in holy slavery to the Blessed Mother at Czestochowa on May 3, 1966. How solemn and grand it would have been had the Holy Father been present there. That was the one desire of the entire nation, of the Polish Episcopate, and especially of the Cardinal Primate who begged competent authorities to allow the Holy Father's visit.

In order to live this period of divine grace in peace and quiet joy, and with greatest spiritual benefit, the Church in Poland wanted to share her joy with the entire Catholic world by sending out invitations to Catholic Hierarchies all over the world.

How great would have been Poland's joy if the members of the American Hierarchy were allowed to attend! Unfortunately, your Bishops and many of the priests were denied the chance to become acquainted with the Polish people and their country, for many of you, the land of your forefathers. But this did not diminish in the least your good will and benevolence to Poland and her Church.

Your compassionate love prompted you to manifest your sentiments for the Polish people and for the Church in and through these Millennium observances programed originally for the arrival of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. There again you were painfully touched by the Cardinal's inability to obtain passport. I wanted so much to see this brave man of God who fearlessly defends the rights of the Church and her faithful, though in consequence he suffers continued harassments and calumnies from the enemies of the Church. You wanted to know more intimately this servant of God whose only ambition in life is to be a true Father to God's People entrusted to his care.

You were denied all this. Yet, your good and generous hearts toward Poland urged you to gather here with your Shepherd, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, to participate in these ceremonies commemorating Poland's Millennium of Christianity.

As the representative of the absent Cardinal Wyszynski, of the Polish Episcopal Conference and of the entire Church in Poland, I want to thank first you, Your Eminence, for having taken a kindly interest in this Millennium observance and for having so generously consented to preside.

I would like to thank H. E. Paulo Cardinal Marella for gracing this occasion with his presence. We wish to thank the H. E. the Most. Rev. Archbishop J. Krol for celebrating this Millennium Mass.

Our special thanks go to the American hierarchy for having invited the Cardinal Primate of Poland, and for all the generous help given to the Church in Poland. Many sincere thanks for the Polish American clergy and Sisters as well as to all lay people who take an active part in Polish American affairs, and especially to all who were responsible for the preparations of today's observance. Our warmest thanks to America, particularly to Polonia—Americans of Polish ancestry—for your constant generosity and goodness of heart. Today's solemnity will serve to tighten the bonds that unite the Church in America with that of Poland, and at the same time strengthen the ties of friendship between the two countries.

Lastly, I beg your fervent prayers for the Church in Poland, for her shepherds and God's people in their care, so that our nation may be always faithful to God and to the Church. Pray that this great year of grace, the year of Sacrum Poloniae Millennium, be a firm foundation for a truly Christian Poland in the second Millennium upon which it is entering now.

Let us offer our prayers through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary whom the Polish nation had so loved that it chose her for its Patroness and Queen. It knows that she is the perfect example for every person wanting to live accordingly to the Will of God, to realine the kingdom of God in his own and in the souls of others. She lived it perfectly. Through Mary to Jesus. Queen of Poland, pray for us.

AID TO FAMILIES OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in support of section 213(a) of the amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965.

This section, of which I am a sponsor, would permit mothers on public assistance who hold jobs under this act to retain part of their earnings. They would be allowed, for a period of not less than a year and not more than 2 years, to keep the first $85 of their monthly income.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide supplementary income to the welfare checks paid to mothers on the aid to families of dependent children—AFDC—program. With the help of such

supplementary income it is hoped that the mothers can learn job skills that will lead to eventual self-sufficiency.

Without any question, Mr. Speaker, adoption of the amendment would benefit mothers employed under the provisions of this act. But considerably more important would be the benefits to society as a whole. This amendment would contribute, I am sure, to the economic and social well-being of our Nation. It would give many mothers who are now on relief the chance to hold jobs and help to support their families. Not all AFDC mothers would choose to work, of course; and those who prefer to spend full time with their children would have the option of doing so, as they have now.

My only regret about this amendment is that it does not go far enough. It is only one step, applying only to mothers employed under one program. I have introduced another bill, H.R. 15167, that would apply to all AFDC mothers, regardless of their employment.

This week, Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota AFL–CIO Federation of Labor is holding its ninth constitutional convention in Rochester. Two resolutions have been submitted to the convention on the subject of AFDC improvements. I insert the text of both in the RECORD. The first, submitted by the Minneapolis Central Labor Union Council, reads as follows:

Whereas: The Minneapolis AFL–CIO Central Labor Union Council has always been aware of the primary objectives of the War on Poverty and has always encouraged individuals who are dependent and who are on welfare roles to improve their education, their skills and gain work experience that will enable them to become self-supporting citizens; and

Whereas: Many mothers of young children feel it is necessary to remain at home to care for their children on a full time basis, and should be encouraged to do so, nevertheless, as children enter school many mothers can and wish to be self-reliant by working; and

Whereas: The existing laws provide little or no financial advantages for AFDC mothers to be employed, thus stifling initiative and ambition and thus denying those mothers who wish to work a sense of competence and independence derived from improving the standard of life of their children and discouraging mothers from participating in the dignity of work to improve their lot in life; and

Whereas: This existing situation does not realistically emphasize that portion of the purpose of AFDC which states that the program should provide "the opportunity for self-support and to strengthen family life"; and

Whereas: The existing law actually hinders rather than encourages an AFDC mother to seek opportunities to continue her education and to seek training and work experience to prepare her for her own self-support as her children grow older and she is no longer eligible for AFDC; and

Whereas: The Federal Government has accepted the principle of realistic incentive income by permitting AFDC mothers who work on the programs of Economic Opportunity Act, Title I and Title II, to retain a portion of their earned income; now, therefore, be it

Resolved: That the 9th Constitutional Convention of the Minnesota AFL–CIO Federation of Labor encourage the Federal Congress and the State Legislature to strengthen the law to permit wider opportunities for AFDC mothers to continue their education and training to change the law both federal and state in order to establish a policy of incentive income that will be both realistic and reasonable that will enhance self-support, normal participation in the community and a spirit of enterprise in the family.

The second, submitted by Council No. 1 of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, reads as follows:

Whereas: Federal legislation permits the states individually to liberalize federal categorical assistance policies, permitting exemption of some earned income of parent or child to improve incentive toward further employment; and

Whereas: This legislation will not result in increased cost to taxpayer; and

Whereas: It will encourage the adult and/or child and he or she may earn a part of the budget as well as the incentive, it could reduce some AFDC payments; and

Whereas: The incentive would mean that assistance families could occasionally enjoy items and/or outings such as non-assistance families usually enjoy; thus children could be provided for more similarity to their classmates with an allowance to give experience in money management and as an incentive to work and thus family life strengthened; now, therefore, be it

Resolved: That the 9th Constitutional Convention of the Minnesota AFL–CIO Federation of Labor, its councils and central bodies support enabling legislation to permit exemption of some earnings to act as incentive to families receiving categorical aid.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, October 16 to 22 marks the annual observance of National Business Women's Week by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

The first observance of this kind took place in 1928 with the announced purpose of dramatizing the contribution of women to the business and professional life of this country.

Since 1928, the observance of this week has become a time to take note of the dignity, the stability and the importance of business and professional women in this country.

More and more, we are being made aware of the important contributions made to our Federal, State, and local governments, to our Nation's economy, to our own local communities and to the private business world by the American woman. She is meeting our Nation's manpower shortages and offering a new dignity to the affairs of this country by her presence, her dependability, and her many worthwhile activities.

It is encouraging to me to note the increasing interest and activity by the Federal Government in extending to women an opportunity to share more fully in the affairs of this country. President Johnson has done much to upgrade the role of women in the American life.

There is still much to be done in this area, however, and we in Congress must continue our efforts in this important area of activity.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs and the other many fine business women's organizations have led in the effort to advance women's rights and upgrade the status of women in this Nation. They are to be commended, encouraged and supported in their good efforts.

I wish to take this opportunity to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to the attention of my colleagues the national legislative platform for 1966–67 adopted by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs. I invite your attention especially to the three action items called for in the platform. These items will benefit men as well as women and deserve our careful consideration:

NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM, 1966–67, ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL CONVENTION, JULY 24–28, 1966, ATLANTA, GA.

LEGISLATIVE PURPOSE

1. To elevate standards for the employed woman, to promote her interests, to create a spirit of cooperation, to expand opportunities through industrial, scientific and vocational activities, to secure equal consideration under the law and to establish conditions which assure both men and women the fullest opportunity and reward for the development of their capacities to the maximum potential.

2. To consider the place and responsibility of the employed woman as a concerned citizen in the complex democratic society of the United States, and to strengthen the role of this nation in world affairs.

ACTION ITEMS

Item 1. Propose and support legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide equality of rights under the law to men and women.

Item 2. Propose and support (a) legislation in the field of employment which provides uniform laws and regulations for men and women as to working hours, working conditions, rates of pay, and equal employment opportunity; (b) uniform legislation for men and women in the areas of taxation and retirement.

Item 3. Propose and support legislation to provide for uniform jury service and uniform qualifications in the selection of men and women to serve on grand or petit juries in any court.

POLICY ITEM

Support measures within the framework of the United States Constitution to promote peace and strengthen national security and make effective the United Nations and such other international organizations of which the United States is a participant.

FREEDOM STUDIES CENTER

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on September 25, the Freedom Studies Center was dedicated at Boston, Va. I, and certainly many other Members, regard this dedication as a historic American event. The nature and the objectives of this new American institution are unique and novel. As a member of the center's congressional advisory committee, I take great pride in this innovation in the American environment. Except in Korea, nowhere in the free world is there a comparable institution devoted to necessary instruction in psychopolitical warfare.

I was privileged to send a member of my staff, Mrs. Irene Neese, to the congressional aids schools conducted recently at the center. The wealth of information and interpretation she received in a short span of time demonstrates the high caliber of this institution. The efforts and contributions of many are responsible for this excellent level of achievement, but it must be nationally recognized that without the leadership and superb educational entrepreneurship of Mr. John M. Fisher, president of the Institute for American Strategy, all of this would not have come to pass. I warmly congratulate him on this achievement and extend my heartiest cooperation for the further development of the center. In this, I know that I am not alone.

Over 1,000 representatives from the broadest conceivable spectrum of our society participated in the dedication of the center. Because of the tremendous importance of this event for our security and our future, which every American should become acquainted with, I append the following indicative items to my remarks at this point:

First. The full text of the program at the center's dedication.

Second. The exemplary dedication expression by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University.

Third. The article by James J. Kilpatrick on "A Great Concept: Freedom Studies Center," which appeared in the October 2 issue of the Sunday Star:

DEDICATION: FREEDOM STUDIES CENTER, BOSTON, VA., SEPTEMBER 25, 1966

MUSIC

U.S. Navy Band, Lieutenant Commander Anthony A. Mitchell, USN, Leader; Warrant Officer Eugene E. McGowan, USN, Conducting

MASTER OF CEREMONIES

Wallace R. Fanning, Jr., NBC

INVOCATION

Reverend Daniel E. Powers, S.J., Director of Public Affairs, Georgetown University

COLORS CEREMONY

Massed Color Guards: Joint Colors Team representing the Armed Services—The American Legion, Department of Virginia—Veterans of Foreign Wars, Culpeper Post

DEDICATION EXPRESSIONS

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Jr., Virginia; Representative JOHN O. MARSH, Jr., Virginia; John M. Fisher, President, Institute for American Strategy; Dr. James D. Atkinson, Faculty Director of First Congressional Aides Seminar; Alan G. Grant, Jr., President, Orlando Committee; Dr. Walter H. Judd, Former Member of Congress; Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut; Admiral Arleigh Burke, Director, Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University; Kenneth D. Wells, Jr., Vice President, Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge; Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee; The Honorable Constantine Visoianu, Former Foreign Minister of Romania; John W. Piercy, Chief, Conferences Division, Department of State; Lieutenant General J. L. Throckmorton, Director of Special Studies, Office of the Chief of Staff, Department of the Army; Rear Admiral James F. Calvert, Director of Politics—Military Policy Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy; Lieutenant General Jack G. Merrell, Comptroller of the Air Force, Department of the Air Force; Brigadier General Earle E. Anderson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Research, Development and Study, U.S. Marine Corps; Admiral Felix B. Stump, USN (Ret.); William C. Dougherty, Jr., Administrator, American Institute for Free Labor Development; Page Groton, Director, Iron Shipbuilders International Marine Council; Andrew C. McLellan, Inter-American Representative, AFL-CIO; Andrew A. Pettis, Vice-President, Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL-CIO; John P. Fraim, Chairman of the Board, Mutual Broadcasting System; Representative DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida; Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Commonwealth of Virginia, and National Commander John E. Davis, The American Legion.

PRESENTATION OF FLAGS

William L. Gray, Commander, Department of Virginia, The American Legion, and Marshall E. Brookman, Commander, Culpeper Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

DEDICATION PRAYER

Reverend Horace D. Douty, Culpeper Presbyterian Church

CLOSING

John M. Fisher

BENEDICTION

Reverend C. N. Dombalis, Saint Constantine and Helen Greek Orthodox Church, Richmond, Virginia

RECEPTION

Music by Georgetown University Concert Band.

FREEDOM STUDIES CENTER: AN HISTORIC AMERICAN EVENT

(Address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University, and chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, at Dedication Ceremonies of the Freedom Studies Center, Boston, Va., September 25, 1966)

Mr. Fanning (Master of Ceremonies), Distinguished Guests, and Dedicated Friends of Freedom, I am greatly honored to be afforded this precious opportunity for a strong expression of warmest greetings and best wishes for the solid success of this Freedom Studies Center. With all passion and guiding reason I convey them on behalf of the National Captive Nations Committee, all its associated branches and groups, here and abroad, and also the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and its supporters on almost every continent of our earth.

Indeed, it would not be presumptuous to say that my words of greeting, hope, and determination also measure and express the suppressed voices and hearts of close to a billion fellow humans trapped in the captivity of over 27 nations in the Red Empire. The vehement and vitriolic denunciations by their totalitarian Red captors against the Captive Nations Week Resoltuion (Public Law 86-90) and our conduct of the annual Week furnish more than adequate negative support for this.

Without an iota of exaggeration or rhetorical pretense, it can veritably be said that the dedication of this Center is a singularly historic event in the glorious annals of our Nation's history. Yes, there are numerous institutions and foundations in this country devoted to the study of freedom, but this Center is unique and unprecedented. For here will be generated the embryo of a Private Freedom Academy which, in its concentration of the intricate field of psycho-political warfare, will be of fundamental, institutional value not only to the security interests of our own country but also to those of every non-Communist state in the Free World. For those of us who for over a decade have struggled to overcome this perilous cultural gap by advocating a public Freedom Academy, only to find ourselves still bogged in the morass of bureaucratic insularity and legislative imbroglio this event is a supremely happy one. And I for one believe it to be manifestly proper and institutionally symbolic (and wholesome) that the alert interests in the private sector of our society pave the way in the knowledge, science, and art of psycho-political warfare—the one field in which the Red totalitarians possess a virtual monopoly of advantage and use.

If in the course of its studies this Center achieves, among its many objectives, the one practical end of transporting into the minds of most Americans the idea, the concept, the scope and extent of professional Red revolutionism, this in itself would be worth unlimited billions of dollars of security and safety. The very idea of a professional Red revolutionary is incomprehensible in this day and age to most American minds. And yet it is this idea and its decades-long realization that, fundamentally, have enslaved close to half of mankind in the far-flung Red Empire. Once our people grasp this idea, all else will inevitably fall into place and this Center, after a period of expansion, will still face an acute housing problem.

Unquestionably, too, this dedication, followed by years of systematic implementation, will produce an enormous impact on the captive nations—not only those in Central-South Europe, but also on the many crucial ones in the Soviet Union itself (Lithuania, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, Cossackia, Turkestan, and Idel-Ural) as well as in Asia, (North Korea, Red China, Tibet, Outer Mongolia, North Vietnam) and in our own hemisphere, Cuba. There is much to be studied and uncovered here, particularly in the non-monolith state of the USSR itself; and here, too, this Center can pioneer intellectually in our American environment and for expansive freedom throughout the world.

My friends, as in everything else human, there will be bumps and bruises in the early development of this indispensable Center, but these will be readily ironed out. As life is more mysterious and miraculous than death, so it is a miracle in itself that this Center has finally come to life, thanks to the tremendous assistance given by you and others throughout the country. Yet all of this assistance would not have congealed into this reality without the painstaking leadership provided by the versatile president of the Institute For American Strategy, Mr. John M. Fisher, to whom I pay our highest tribute and esteem.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Oct. 2, 1966]

A GREAT CONCEPT: FREEDOM STUDIES CENTER

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

BOSTON, VA.—The tiny community of Boston, Va., lies some 80 miles southwest of "Big Washington." It is 10 miles up the road from Culpeper. On to the west lie Scrabble,

Woodville, Sperryville, and "Little Washington," and beyond them lie the Blue Ridge Mountains. Boston thus is situated in the midst of the most beautiful 200 square miles in the world, if not in the universe, but until last Sunday this wide space on Route 522 had no other distinction.

Now Boston, Va., is on the map. If plans of the Institute for American Strategy come to fulfillment—and these plans already are far along—the Institute's new "Freedom Studies Center" at Boston one day may become as well known in its field as the Naval Academy at Annapolis or the military academy at West Point. The Center, dedicated a week ago, has but a single purpose: It is to turn out graduates who know as much of the tactics and strategy of communism as prospective admirals know of the tactics and strategy of naval warfare.

Toward this end, the Institute for American Strategy some months ago acquired a 671-acre tract of land in Culpeper County, a mile or so from the wide space known as Boston. The property includes an impressive stone mansion that rises out of the hills as naturally as a granite boulder. From its courtyard, one may look to the Hazel River, plunging over rapids far below. In the middle distance, Black Angus cattle graze on green mountain meadows. On beyond are the soft and silent mountains, slate blue and dark blue, and still darker blue. Here the students will come.

It is important to touch on the setting, for the leaders of the Institute for American Strategy chose this lovely stillness as deliberately as any Thoreau at Walden Pond. They could have established their Freedom Studies Center smack in the middle of Big Washington or in some glass hutch on the Hudson. But their conviction is that men who would master great ideas need some measure of great tranquility to grasp them in. The small community of scholars they envision is not to be distracted by a jangling urbanism, pressing in.

The name of the "Freedom Studies Center" is a model of precision. The idea is to bring in small groups at first—25 or 30 at a time—for seminars of a few days or a few weeks. Twenty-eight congressional aides came as a vanguard to Boston on September 21 for four days of intensive studies. The next such group may be chosen from industrial leaders, then from professors of history and political science. In time, as a prospective building program moves ahead, most of the full-time students (about 400 in all) will be graduate students chosen from participating universities. They will study freedom, what it is, why the West must preserve it, how the East would twist freedom into slavery.

This is training in psychopolitical warfare. For those closest to the project, it is a dream coming true.

More than eight years ago, a group in Orlando, Fla., headed by Alan G. Grant, Jr., perceived the need for an academy that would train key men in government, in the armed services, in academia, and in private life in certain nonmilitary aspects of Communist aggression. They envisioned a govment-financed academy, patterned generally after West Point and Annapolis.

The idea was embodied in various House and Senate bills, sponsored by members of Congress from across the political spectrum: Senators FONG, Keating, DOUGLAS, PROXMIRE, LAUSCHE, DODD, HICKENLOOPER, Goldwater, MUNDT. The range was as wide in the House. But under the wet blankets of the State Department's opposition, the bills regularly went to sleep in committee.

Then the idea developed—and it was a better idea in every way—for the proposed Academy to be brought into being with private funds. The Institute for American Strategy, founded in 1958, took the lead. Fifty-five educational institutions and major organizations offered their support. To date, nearly $800,000 has been donated or pledged by leading foundations, corporations and individuals. A long-range goal has been set of $11 million. The land and the manor house are bought and paid for. The Center is now an institution in being.

The congressional aides who came here for the shakedown seminar heard a dozen cold war experts—Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Dr. Eleanor Dulles, Walter Judd, Allen Dulles. They heard Dr. Frederick Barghoorn, of Yale, on "Soviet Propaganda with Special Reference to Peace and Disarmament Themes." Two spokesmen from the AFL-CIO's National Maritime Union gave them insight on the cold war at sea. By the time the seminar ended, their heads were bursting with new understanding of the pivotal struggle of this century.

Not one nickel of "CIA money," or any other government money, has gone into the Freedom Studies Center. It is intended to be the voluntary contribution of a voluntary society toward its own survival. The scholars and officials who are invited to come here will come at their own expense, or on Foundation grants. And because the Center is not an agency of government, it will be free to pursue the study of freedom and communism untroubled by the inhibitions of diplomacy. It is a great concept in terms of the total struggle between West and East, as solid as the distant mountains, as clear and cold as the stream.

ASSISTANCE FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are, today, debating the merits of H.R. 13161, legislation to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools.

I have always supported adequate aid to our elementary and secondary schools as a major weapon in the battle against poverty and in the effort to raise educational standards of our developing youngsters.

Educational facilities and education in itself has become an investment in the foundation of our country. In our battle against poverty, education contributes directly to our economic growth because it improves the quality of our labor force. We are no longer in the era where a high school diploma serves as a stepping stone to a job, and in this respect we must provide our children, especially from low-income families, the education which they need to become a productive force of America. We must start this development at the lowest level of our educational endeavor and continue it through to the end of a student's scholastic career.

Our failure to provide adequate educational achievements can only result in low earning capacities, a high rate of unemployment, high rates of rejections for military service, and a definite dependence upon various types of relief programs.

It is my opinion that a sound and constructive bill to provide educational benefits at the Federal level would make a great impact on the educational problems which now face us and will continue to be a factor in the future.

In the pursuit of education we must not take measures that would cut out any of the Federal programs now in effect to advance our educational systems. I am, Mr. Speaker, of the opinion that we should provide adequate funds to continue our obligations to the school districts, not suddenly cut down their programs.

Many school districts have come to rely on Federal payments as an annual component of their budgets. Many districts have already planned their programs for next year, on the funds they anticipated from present Federal laws regarding our educational potential. Any radical reduction in the amount of funds actually available would force disruptive retrenchment in the educational services provided by those districts. If we are to make any drastic reductions, they should be made over a period of years to allow school districts the time they need for replanning.

There is no lessening need for education. We are, day in and day out, reaching further out into space and we shall be in need of better educated people to continue our explorations.

The Congress has appropriated funds for Headstart programs but at the time when we need to continue our educational endeavors we are pulling the rug from under the school districts by refusing to meet their rising costs of educational facilities and the need for additional Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, I favor strong aid to education because there have been wide gaps between the fiscal needs and resources, not only among the separate States but often among the school districts of the wealthier States.

This is not the time to curtail our assistance to meet the future educational needs of this country. In fact, we should encourage education in all its phases to expand for the economical well-being of our Nation.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that at the conclusion of the debate on this bill, we will have come up with legislation which will prove our faith in our educational system and provide adequate funds to our schools and libraries where this assistance is most acutely needed.

Our crucial needs at the elementary and secondary school levels are growing more intensified every day. We cannot retreat in our efforts to help our school programs and I, again, stress the need for meeting this problem.

Mr. Speaker, let us not neglect our educational system by forcing it to operate, as one would say, "on a shoestring."

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, I, among others, have introduced a bill which would provide for the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson, our 28th President.

I am proud that President Wilson was once the Governor of our great State of New Jersey, which served him as the stepping stone to the Presidency. It was fortunate that we, in New Jersey, also had him as the president of Princeton University from 1902 to 1910, where he served as a professor of jurisprudence and political economy from 1890 to 1910.

President Wilson, during his tenure in office, has shown his interest in protecting American freedom and the peace of the world. His most significant peace proposal was embodied in his fourteen points for peace which he presented on January 8, 1918, and which has become a state paper of worldwide influence.

In connection with the proposed memorial, the Washington Post of October 4, 1966, carried a short but inspirational editorial. Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to have his editorial placed into the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The editorial follows:

THE WILSON MEMORIAL

"In Washington, Capital of the most affluent Nation in history, no intellectual crossroads exists to meet the needs of wayfaring scholars," Professor Julian Boyd observed two years ago in his presidential address to the American Historial Association. "Graduate students and seasoned veterans alike who come here from this and many other countries have no place to live and associate with others of like purpose, no staff of experts to advise them . . ."

The Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission has done a signal service, both to scholarship and to this city, in proposing an international center for scholars immediately north of the Archives. The center would be entirely consistent with the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan; from the viewpoint of those who would use the center, the convenience of the site could not be improved. The Commission has notably fulfilled its intention to devise a memorial that would recall not only the name of a great man, but also the spirit that guided him.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT BILL

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, unfortunately due to a long-standing commitment in my district, I missed the special order discussion of the important community development district bill initiated by the gentleman from Tennessee and joined in by my other colleagues from districts similar to mine. I will make my comments at this time.

Mr. Speaker, today's rural communities are no more free of problems than today's urban centers. We are currently providing assistance to urban areas in an attempt to overcome some of their growth and development problems.

This same kind of help should be available to the nonmetropolitan areas of our Nation. The Community Development District Act will provide the authority to extend planning assistance to predominately rural areas.

It is not economical for the small- or medium-sized city to attempt to achieve metropolitan standards of service, opportunities, and culture in isolation from the neighboring rural communities.

Community development districts will provide an incentive and an administrative vehicle for coordinated planning on the basis of units of sufficient size and scope to permit more efficient use of local, State, and other Federal resources available from existing sources.

I particularly wish to cite Meigs County, within the 10th Congressional District, as typical of areas to be aided by S. 2934. Earlier this year, after considerable local initiative, time, and effort, the county commissioners of Meigs County, through Mr. Jack Crisp of Langsville, Ohio, chairman of a local watershed association, submitted to the Economic Development Administration an application for a technical assistance grant of only $61,152. The sum of $11,680 was to be supplied by local groups to establish in Meigs County a development center. Some of the purposes of this center would be:

First. Advising industrial and business officials in the county on sources of financial assistance from EDA, SBA, and other State and Federal, as well as private lenders.

Second. Providing new job opportunities through expansion of the county's 26 industrial firms and creation of a new "internal" industries program.

Third. Developing major industrial sites along the Ohio River and in other parts of the county for prospective industrial firms.

Fourth. Developing new agricultural enterprises in the county such as the expansion of new greenhouses in select areas of the country for growing tomatoes for Columbus, Cleveland, and Cincinnati metropolitan markets.

Fifth. Utilizing the county's important mineral and geological resources including gas, coal, timber, sand, shale, salt, limestone, and water resources.

Sixth. Developing the county's outstanding tourism and recreational potentials and historical resources.

At the time this proposal was submitted by the local people to EDA, I informed them that I did not think EDA could handle such local, nonregional types of programs. This Agency, under its authority from Congress, is making great strides in bolstering the economy of many areas. The 10th District of Ohio has and will continue to be helped by the fine organization put together by Assistant Secretary of Commerce Foley. The Meigs County situation simply did not fit the EDA pattern. At the time I explained to the sponsors of the proposal that the administration had legislation pending that would meet the needs, desires, and aspirations of a Meigs County in any State. This legislation is the community development district bill, S. 2934, which I earnestly hope will soon be brought before the House. Certainly no one who is reasonable and fair thinking could deny that to enable our rural and country areas to attract people from our congested and multiburdened metropolitan areas is not a wise move.

In recent months the President and such a distinguished representative of the business community as Mr. William B. Murphy, chairman of the National Business Advisory Council and president of the Campbell Soup Co., have spoken eloquently on what we must do in our efforts to retard the fatal outmigration from our rural areas to our multiburdened cities of the solid people who live in the small town and country place.

These and other spokesmen have pointed out rewards to industry and the enriched life for people that can be had in the small communities that dot our great country from coast to coast. When a dispute over public transportation can halt the commercial, business, and cultural life of millions of people—and when we see a combination of frustrations lead to the violent expression of resentments—surely we are seeing signals that it is time to consider alternatives to ever larger urban complexes.

A promising alternative is making more adequate public and private services—and more jobs—available in rural America. The community development district bill can meaningfully assist in this great effort.

Community development districts offer a way to effectively explore, and exploit, this alternative. They can contribute to the building and rebuilding of a physical, social, economic, and cultural environment which by 1975 must accommodate 225 million men and women and children.

Whether we force 225 million Americans to stack up, or enable them to spread out, is a decision our people, our business and industrial and service and banking communities, and every level of government faces right now.

In Ohio we are initiating some of our development activities on a regional or district basis. I feel that this is a move toward sound and efficient community development assistance.

Many rural communities are not taking advantage of Federal aid programs currently available. This is due primarily to two things: First, people do not know about the programs and, second, they are not eligible to participate without first having a comprehensive plan.

The Community Development District Act would permit small cities and county governments to organize a district, hire and supervise their own district planners

and participate fully in planning and economic and cultural activities.

Could any Member of this House deny them this assistance? The small- and medium-sized cities in predominantly rural areas, are able to marshal sufficient physical, human, and financial resources to achieve a satisfactory level of social and economic development, such as Meigs County has done. This is true, despite the fact that many rural communities lag behind urban areas in income, educational attainment, housing, health care, and public facilities. This legislation will not duplicate nor supplant any kind of Federal aid for planning available from any other program. It will simply extend to predominantly rural districts the kind of help already available for urban communities. It will enable predominantly rural districts to plan for all the needs of all their residents—both urban and rural.

Requests for the grants-in-aid to set up districts under this program will originate with the local governments as in the Meigs County situation. Plans developed by the district would represent a voluntary plan of action agreed to by the participating local and State governments, and would be advisory but not binding. Under the community development district bill, grants will be available to district boards from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in amounts certified by the Secretary of Agriculture. They will cover up to 75 percent of the cost of salaries and expenses for a professional staff to be hired by the district board for community development district planning.

Planning incentive grants would be made in an amount up to 10 percent of the amount of other Federal planning grants made within the district. This would enable the district board to coordinate all planning activities within the district, so that local, State, and Federal Governments will be assured of getting maximum returns from their investments in development projects.

Grants under this act would be included in the $230 million already authorized by section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended. Up to $5 million would be requested for grants to community development districts in the first year.

Again, I appeal to all Members of this great body from urban as well as rural areas to think deeply about what is proposed most modestly here. In concluding, I am reminded of the inherent wisdom of the words of our great Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, when he testified before the Senate Agricultural and Forestry Committee on this legislation. He said:

> Doesn't it seem ridiculous to contemplate creating more and more artificial hills at $3,000 each . . . more and more $8,000 sandboxes . . . when we have so many places in the nation where the hills and the sand are real, are more abundant, and are free for children whose dads have rewarding work there, or who can move into rural America and find such work?
>
> There is something for everybody—including our children—in a purposeful program of Rural Community Development. It is in helping rural Americans help themselves improve their total environment so that more and more families can know freedom of choice in living places, that the Community Development District proposal has merit, and great promise.

HOME LEAVE FOR FEDERAL SEAFARING EMPLOYEES

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize home leave for Federal seafaring employees. The purpose of my bill is to facilitate the recruitment and retention by the Government of personnel for its oceangoing marine positions by authorizing the granting of home leave for service rendered by such personnel on extended voyages.

A survey by the U.S. Civil Service Commission of the four Federal agencies which are the principal employers of seafaring personnel discloses that the Government's ability to recruit and retain qualified crewmembers is seriously hampered by the inadequacy of certain fringe benefits—particularly vacation privileges—available to the Government's seafaring employees. There are shortages of licensed engineers, deck officers, skilled deck and engineering personnel, and radio officers for oceangoing ships. Turnover in Federal marine employment is considerably in excess of turnover of employees in other Government activities. The shortages and excessive turnover will become more acute as the demand increases for shipping in support of troops in Vietnam and other commitments abroad.

Civilian crews of Government vessels man the personnel and cargo carriers of the Military Sea Transportation Service, the research and survey ships of the Departments of the Interior and Commerce, the tugs and floating cranes of the Department of Army; and certain vessels of the Panama Canal Company. They number approximately 10,000, with 90 percent in the Military Sea Transportation Service, and over 98 percent of them serve aboard oceangoing vessels.

These civilian maritime employees are paid in accordance with prevailing industry rates, but their leave rights are the same as the leave rights of other Federal employees. The leave benefits of crewmen in the maritime industry are far superior to such leave benefits of Federal employees. The Civil Service Commission study stressed this disparity in leave benefits as a principle because of the Government's difficulty in recruiting and retaining qualified civilian crews for its oceangoing vessels.

The bill I have introduced would materially improve the competitive position of the Government in the recruitment and retention of needed seafaring personnel.

The bill authorizes the granting of home leave to personnel serving on any oceangoing vessel on an extended voyage, at a rate of not more than 2 days for each 30 calendar days of such service. This home leave will be in addition to the regular annual leave now authorized by law, and will accumulate for future use. The home leave will not be the basis for any lump sum payment upon separation from the service, and may be granted as terminal leave only under special or emergency circumstances as provided by regulations to be issued by the Civil Service Commission.

With respect to terminal leave, it is intended that "special or emergency circumstances" will include, without limitation, administrative refusal or failure to authorize use of home leave when requested and inability of an employee to use such leave due to circumstances which are beyond his control and not due to his own act or omission.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation will not make the leave benefits of Federal maritime personnel fully comparable to the industry leave benefits. The industry benefits system, with its numerous variations based on positions and location, is not suitable to Federal employment. Extension of the industry benefits system to Federal employees would involve unjustified costs and administrative difficulties. However, establishment of the home leave system authorized by the bill will provide equitable and reasonable treatment of Federal seafaring personnel in their relationship to employees in other Federal positions and in industry.

CONSUMERS' RIGHTS

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in his consumer message of January 1964, said:

> For far too long, the consumer has had too little voice and too little weight in government. As a worker, as a lawyer or doctor, the citizen has had to take a back seat. . . . We cannot rest content until he is in the front row, not displacing the interest of the producer, yet gaining equal rank and representation with that interest.

Again in 1966 he reiterated:

> A new and progressive program is needed if we are to protect the American consumer's rights in the marketplace—his right to be informed, to choose, to be protected from unsafe products and to be heard in the councils of government.

On April 19th of this year, the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the House Government Operations Committee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, opened hearings to consider my bill, H.R. 7179, for the creation of a

Cabinet-level Department of Consumers which would give the American consumer an effective voice within the Federal Government. Six years ago, a similar bill was introduced by the late Senator Estes Kefauver and 23 of his distinguished colleagues, but, at that time the bill never gained momentum. Since 1960, however, a growing awareness of the consumer's plight in our complex and rapidly changing economy has raised issues which will lie dormant no longer. In particular, the problems of the poor consumer—symptomatic of deficiencies in consumer-protection across the land—have raised a fundamental question to which an answer must now be forthcoming: Is our present institutional structure adequate to our concern for the consumer?

I

In our search for answers to this question, the subcommittee, at the hearings this year, sought the views of some 20-odd witnesses; experts on consumer affairs, State officials concerned with consumer protection, representatives from private consumer groups, including representatives of the poor, and spokesmen for the Federal Government. Their testimony suggests that the present institutional structure is, indeed, inadequate for the proper protection of consumer interests. As a result, Chairman DAWSON has now established a special inquiry on consumer representation in the Federal Government of which I will have the honor to act as chairman. Its first hearing will be held on October 10 to examine the extent to which the Office of Economic Opportunity is meeting its responsibilities to the poor as consumers.

Consumers from all walks of life can be, and are, victimized by the unscrupulous. But it is the poor who suffer most. As Cernoria Johnson, director of the National Urban League, described their plight:

> Thanks to poor education, they may not be able to read labels or advertisements. They lack the training which would lead to comparison shopping, price comparison, and the effective questioning of the practices of retail purveyors. Bound to local neighborhoods, they do not travel in search of better bargains, nor are they exposed to information such as newspaper advertisements which would inform them of the possibility of better bargains. Compensating for lack of achievement, they often-times aspire to consume highly visible status-giving goods, and so become susceptible to fraudulent or high-powered advertising, with consequent ensnarement in heavy installment debts, legal entanglements, and repossession claims.
>
> Lacking the ability to consume wisely, the impoverished are subject to a variety of exploitative forces. Retail goods are marked up in price, often to higher levels than in more affluent communities. Unlabeled and outdated merchandise is sold to purchasers who do not exercise quality control.

Since the poor are usually regarded as bad credit risks, the credit available to them often commands exorbitant prices. In many cases, credit sales are made with no other thought than to garnishee the customer's salary. Employers faced with double bookkeeping chores arising out of garnishees often prefer tc fire the employee. Thus, in its most vicious form, credit selling where the customer is ignorant of the consequences can destroy his very livelihood. Unable to rely on a personal income, the unfortunate victim must seek public welfare. This harms both him and society.

Only consumer education can break this vicious cycle of ignorance and exploitation. In Harlem and in the Bedford-Stuyvesant areas of New York City, local organizations have recently undertaken extensive research into prices and unscrupulous commercial practices, using the poor themselves to gather the information and to pass it on to others. These pilot programs have been successful in broadening the awareness of the poor consumers involved. In some cases, their findings have prompted the creation of food-buying clubs, credit unions, and other cooperative enterprises greatly improving the buying power of the poor. Such successes have demonstrated that the poor can help themselves to become intelligent consumers if only they are provided with the tools to get information about the marketplace. But this requires research and costs money, and both are generally in short supply.

Local initiative is behind most of what is being done for the poor consumer today. It is necessarily scattered and fragmented, pointing up the need for a national attack on the problem. The urgent requirement now is for communication between consumer groups working on similar problems in the ghettos, for coordination of their services, and for funding to conduct investigations and gather information about ghetto conditions.

Although the poor suffer most, rich and poor alike share consumer problems which cut across all economic strata. Anyone can be defrauded by a deceptive package, an inferior product sold as something better, or an appliance repair job which claimed more repairs than were in fact made. In the home improvements industry alone, it has been estimated that of the $13 billion worth of business done annually, somewhere between $500 million and $1 billion are lost to the public because of consumer fraud. The attorney general of California has revealed that the losses to the public and legitimate business in California resulting from the sales of defective aluminum siding alone are over $7 million per year. Not confined to the home improvements industry, extensive frauds of this sort affect consumers from all walks of life, presenting a national rather than a local problem.

Yet under the present institutional arrangement, there is no single Federal agency or department to which the consumer, poor or rich, can turn with confidence.

To meet the increased incidence of consumer fraud and deception, several State governments have been forced to set up special consumer counsels within the attorney general's office. But their task is vastly complicated by the frequently national scope of fraudulent practices. As the assistant attorney general of New York, Mr. Barnett Levy, testified at our hearings in New York on April 29:

> Many of the slick promoters are of the hit-and-run variety who, after saturating one area with their shoddy goods and service, literally pull up stakes and move on to greener pastures, many times moving their location from one state to another.

Similarly, such practices as deceptive advertising and mail order fraud often cross State lines and are therefore not controllable on the State level.

Law enforcement in the consumer field cannot be left to the uncoordinated efforts of State and local authorities and to the present scattering of Federal regulatory agencies. All who testified on behalf of consumer protection—in particular, Wisconsin's Attorney General Bronson La Follette and New York's Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz—were agreed that their efforts were handicapped without Federal oversight. Under the existing arrangement, there is much duplication and little coordination. A single Federal department could fulfill a much-needed service to all 50 attorneys general across the country. As a clearinghouse for interstate operations, the Department would be the pivot, the central store of information, in a nationally coordinated effort to enforce the rights of consumers.

II

The recently created President's Committee on Consumer Interests is but a partial answer to the need. It lacks statutory authority. It conducts only limited programs of its own and administers no laws. Its operating philosophy is primarily to encourage existing organizations in their struggle to assure the consumer his rights. The Committee is, at best, an advisory body without legal powers.

Advocates of the existing institutional order have argued that the consumer's interests are more than adequately represented throughout the Federal Government. As evidence, they point to some 33 different agencies and departments engaged in consumer-oriented activities. They assume, moreover, that because the consumer's voice has always been muted in government, his interests are too broad and disparate to be isolated and defined, and, consequently, to be represented by a single institutional structure. But this view is the obverse of the reality: the consumer's voice has been silent because there has been no one place to which he could turn for information or redress. The recent regional conference report of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests said: "It was evident throughout the four regional conferences that consumers harbor many more complaints than they attempt to register, for there is an unmistakable fatalism toward what is regarded as the futility of individuals expressing themselves effectively in the maze of the marketplace." Consumers need help and will seek it when it is offered.

In practice, consumer protection is, at best, an incidental function in the Government agencies and departments where it is distributed. Thus, it is not

surprising that the consumer interest is frequently ignored or neglected, even in cases where it clearly should be heard. Instances of poor coordination in the dissemination of consumer information, of inadequate representation of consumer interests before the regulatory agencies, and of frequent defeat in Congress of consumer-protective legislation, all attest to the need for an institution vested with the power to assure the consumer his rights in these areas.

The General Services Administration sets quality and price standards for products it buys for the Government. The Agriculture Department inspects and grades meats and sets prices for a wide variety of agricultural commodities and dairy products. The Department of the Interior inspects fish, and the Federal Trade Commission establishes advertising standards for all these products. Without oversight, this proliferation of functions makes it difficult to coordinate and disseminate the findings of the various agencies. An example recently cited by Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF is illustrative of what can happen:

> In the pesticide field the Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, the Public Health Service, and the Interior Department all vie with one another, not only in their day-to-day operations, but in the policy area, too. Interior forbids its constituent agents to use in national forests the same poisons that the Agriculture Department urges the public to spray on lawns, trees, and rosebushes. The Public Health Service spends public funds to study the possible connection between the cancer toll and the increased use of pesticides, while the Food and Drug Administration says the housewives' market basket is "safe from pesticide residue."

Although the regulatory agencies are intended to be the real agents of the consumer interests in our Government, they are subject to producer pressures which far outweigh any countervailing force mustered by consumers. Inadequately financed and staffed, and overburdened with caseloads they cannot quickly expedite, these agencies are often reduced to the expediency of settling the conflicting claims of rival producers. Thus it is that the Interstate Commerce Commission mediates a dispute between railroads and trucks. The Civil Aeronautics Board adjudicates the claims of large certified carriers and smaller airlines. The Federal Communications Commission referees the battle of the networks or the rivalries of TV and radio. The Federal Power Commission must arbitrate free trade and protectionist squabbles. More often than not, the consumer is the lowest common denominator in a process which has been carried out in his name though not in his presence.

One of the key provisions in my bill for a Department of Consumers would give the consumer equal rank and representation with the producer. Section 6 proposes the establishment of a Consumer Counsel empowered to intervene as a party before any U.S. regulatory agency in nonadjudicative matters when the Secretary determines such matters may substantially affect the economic interests of consumers. It also authorizes the Department to appear before any appellate court of the United States as amicus curiae in a proceeding involving the review of any order by any regulatory agency, or any civil judgment, decree, or order entered into by a district court relating to trade and commerce. Combined with the Department's power to evaluate and receive complaints, these provisions would enable the Federal Government, for the first time, to initiate direct preventive action in the protection of consumer interests.

The fate of the truth-in-packaging bill, which has been before Congress for more than 5 years, is proof of the need for a strong voice to press the consumer viewpoint on pending legislation. Despite wholehearted administration support for this bill, it failed to emerge intact when the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported it out on September 22. Its most important provisions, establishing mandatory Federal standardization of weights, quantities, sizes, and shapes of packages, were removed, thus pulling the bill's teeth. This is not to suggest that industry lobbying was in any way improper, but that the consumer viewpoint should have been equally represented, independent of the administration's support.

III

The consumer function is as important to America's economic growth as the producer function. Yet, for years, our governmental institutions have been so well attuned to producer interests that this reality has nearly been forgotten. Our long neglect of the consumer's importance has led to imbalances and distortions in the flow of our national resources. We cannot expect the free enterprise system to function properly, nor can we hope for a rational distribution of money resources in an economy where the consumer function, either through ignorance or fraud, is not exercised freely and intelligently. Mr. David Borden, Director of Block Communities, Inc., in New York City made an effective point of this in testimony before the subcommittee when he said:

> The Nation cannot afford an economy which does not serve the interest of all its people. There is an enormous and irresponsible misappropriation of private funds as they flow in and out of an urban ghetto. Too often, private revenue in the form of income flees the neighborhood to be replaced by massive public aid. The economy of the ghetto as well as the economy of the city itself can and must be a vital, legal, and opportunity-creating entity. If it continues to deteriorate, no one suffers more than the consumer.

I am convinced, therefore, that giving the consumer Cabinet-level representation is also good economics.

It is my great and earnest hope that the special inquiry to be launched October 10 will usher in a new deal for the American consumer. Its establishment promises, for the first time, that Congress will take a comprehensive look at consumer problems and at the Federal Government's programs to solve them. Ultimately, I expect that these investigations will throw new light on the institutional changes required for the protection and representation of the consumer's interests.

I do not believe that the provisions of H.R. 7179 are above improvement. But I am firmly convinced that no bill is adequate unless it incorporates two inseparable principles: the consumer's right to be informed, and his right to be heard at all levels of government. Neither of these rights is assured unless we give the consumer a single institution with powers to gather and coordinate the dissemination of information, and to represent his interests before the regulatory agencies, in the courts, and in the halls of Congress. I intend to see that these rights are fulfilled.

SOUTH BEND, IND., COMES BACK STRONG TO SHARE IN THE NATION'S PROSPERITY

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, 2½ years have passed since the Studebaker Corp. of South Bend, Ind., in my congressional district, stopped manufacturing automobiles in the United States. During that time the coordinated efforts of thousands of people in the community and at all levels of government focused on the human problems created by that economic disaster.

I am proud to say that today South Bend is once again a booming city. Its citizens are fully sharing in the prosperous economy of our State and the Nation.

I rise today to bring the story of South Bend's dramatic recovery to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. For I believe that if communities in their congressional districts should suffer the loss of a major industry, they may find both encouragement and valuable lessons from a study of the South Bend experience.

Those of us involved in attempts to revitalize the economy of the South Bend area have learned many lessons. It is my intention here to chronicle the activities during this period of recovery in order that my colleagues and others will know what measures were taken to achieve one of the most extraordinary comeback stories in Hoosier history.

ECONOMIC PICTURE NOW IMPRESSIVE

There is truly a remarkable success story in the revitalization of the South Bend economy. Consider these impressive facts about our current economic position:

In September of 1966 the unemployment rate for the South Bend area was 2.3 percent, below the rates for both Indiana and the Nation.

Total employment in the area was about 104,000, a gain of more than 3,000 over last year and more than 10,000 above the figure in January 1961.

Thirteen industries employing 4,000 persons now occupy the former Studebaker complex, representing both new plants and expanded local operations.

Kaiser-Jeep Corp. took over and completed in South Bend the $87 million Studebaker military truck contract. Since then Kaiser-Jeep has successfully bid on additional military truck contracts totaling over three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Sixty-eight area manufacturing companies have either located new plants or expanded existing facilities since the Studebaker shutdown.

Furthermore our booming economy has created a shortage of skilled workers in a number of technical fields. To help relieve this shortage the city of South Bend plans to build an area vocational school at a cost of $1.6 million. This school, which will train workers for the many firms in the South Bend area that require skilled workers, will be constructed with the help of funds from the Vocational Education Act of 1963, of which I was proud to be a sponsor in the House of Representatives.

SHUTDOWN AFFECTS 7,000

This bright picture is in sharp contrast to the gloom in South Bend on December 9, 1963, the day that the Studebaker Corp. announced that it was ending its automotive production in the United States. This was a bitter pre-Christmas message to the firm's nearly 7,000 workers, who represented about 8 percent of the total work force of St. Joseph County.

The closing of the Studebaker plant ended a long and proud company history that began in South Bend in 1852 with the opening of a wagon building and blacksmith's shop. At one time the company had employed nearly 25,000 people, but its work force had been reduced to just over 8,000, 2 months before the announcement of the closing, and was reduced still more by the time the gates were officially closed.

Clearly, the worst part of the immediate reaction was psychological. The loss of the city's largest manufacturing plant brought to many the terrible visions of a ghost town. But from the outset concerned people throughout South Bend and St. Joseph County directed their attention and energies to finding remedies for this economic misfortune.

The problem we faced was grave indeed. In November 1963, one month before the announcement of the closing, the unemployment rate for the South Bend area was 2.1 percent—a record low. Four months later, over 9 percent of the total labor force was jobless. There were in addition undetermined, but widespread, economic effects on local Studebaker suppliers, retail stores, banks, realtors, and other business enterprises.

The average age of the Studebaker employees was 54; 20 percent were Negro, representing about a third of the city's Negro labor force; most were longtime employees; almost two-thirds were unskilled; and approximately 700 were physically handicapped.

On December 20, 1963, almost all of these employees drew their final paychecks. It was immediately apparent that the routine services provided to the unemployed would be inadequate to cope with this massive problem.

South Bend Mayor Lloyd M. Allen created a Mayor's Committee on the Studebaker Problem to coordinate efforts at recovery. Named as cochairmen of the committee were Franklin D. Schurz, editor and publisher of the South Bend Tribune, and Paul D. Gilbert, a retail clothier, both men widely regarded as civic and community leaders.

One of the principal obstacles confronting those engaged in efforts to revitalize the economy was the longstanding belief of many in the community that without Studebaker the city's economy could never recover completely. The firm's annual payroll, although it had experienced wide fluctuations, was in excess of $30 million. The committee therefore undertook the important task of allaying the fears of many citizens that recovery in the near future would be next to impossible.

Immediately upon receiving word of the Studebaker plant closing, Indiana Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH and I, as the district's Congressman, communicated our profound concern to President Johnson. The President quickly responded by setting up an Interdepartmental Committee to assist South Bend in meeting its problems.

PRESIDENT TAKES ACTION

This action was followed up by the President on December 24, 1963, when he directed—

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges to have the Area Redevelopment Administration "work with the local South Bend community in its efforts to attract new industry to the area."

The Interdepartmental Committee to "send to South Bend a full-time official who will remain on the spot to coordinate all Federal activities with the officials of the State and local government." The man selected for this task was Dr. Harold L. Sheppard of the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. Dr. Sheppard, an expert in the problems of unemployment, spent 90 days in South Bend and Washington, conferring with people at all levels, spotting problems, bringing them to the attention of the Interdepartmental Committee, providing new and imaginative ideas, and, in the process, gathering material for his report to the administration.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz to establish "the maximum number of training projects consistent with the needs and demands of the area" under newly enacted provisions of the manpower training law.

Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman to "do whatever is necessary to expedite the distribution of surplus food to the large number of displaced workers."

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara "to the extent consistent with sound procurement policies, to see that the $87 million Studebaker military truck contract is completed in South Bend."

RECOVERY DRIVE PLANNED

Following the President's directives of December 24, the Interdepartmental Committee held periodic meetings under the cochairmanship of the Area Redevelopment Administrator, William L. Batt, and the Economic Adviser to the Secretary of Labor, Stanley H. Ruttenberg. Meetings were attended by representatives of the Departments of Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Defense, Post Office, Agriculture, and various independent agencies, including General Services Administration, Veterans' Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and Small Business Administration.

Senators HARTKE, BAYH, and I, or members of our respective staffs, also attended these meetings. Participating in addition were representatives of the community, the United Auto Workers, the Indiana State government and the Studebaker Corp.

During the ensuing months a number of activities were set in motion to meet the crisis.

For example, South Bend was one of the first cities in the Nation to begin a worker retraining program under the Manpower Development and Training Act. In limited operation locally before the Studebaker closing, the program was subsequently greatly expanded. During the past 2½ years, over 2,500 trainees have graduated from training projects and 70 percent have found employment in occupations for which they were trained.

Project ABLE—ability based on long experience—was a coordinated effort of the Department of Labor and the National Council on Aging designed to assist the hundreds of ex-Studebaker workers over the age of 50 with counseling, testing, and job placement. The program was in operation for 18 months and proved to be highly successful.

In early March of 1964, the Indiana Senators and I, in cooperation with the South Bend Chamber of Commerce, the Department of Defense, and other Federal agencies, sponsored a 2-day procurement conference in South Bend. More than 450 persons registered at the conference. Some 339 firms were added to the bidders' lists of Government agencies, and more than 300 sets of bids were issued to the companies attending by the Department of Defense alone.

ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES

The Department of Agriculture liberalized eligibility requirements to permit surplus food distribution to approximately 2,800 individuals from families of former Studebaker workers.

The Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration sent representatives to provide information for those requesting forbearances on FHA- and VA-insured mortgages.

The Department of Labor sent a team of specialists to South Bend to analyze the unemployment and to start special

procedures to handle the mass layoff. This was done through a program of expanded and intensified direct personal services to the workers involved. These services were provided by the U.S. Employment Service and the State employment service offices.

Studebaker executives, government officials, labor leaders, and the chamber of commerce through its committee of 100 played an important role in attracting new industries to locate in the 7½ million square feet of factory space vacated by Studebaker or elsewhere in the area.

The South Bend-Mishawaka Labor-Management Commission announced "a maturity of mutual understanding" between labor and management and pointed to a 93.6-percent decline in work stoppages between 1957 and 1964. The commission's report was distributed nationally with the objective of merchandising the area's economic assets and dispelling "the ghost of a bad labor image of the past."

The results of these efforts speak for themselves: South Bend has truly come back. Because of our magnificent economic recovery we are now enjoying a period of unprecedented growth and prosperity in South Bend, neighboring Mishawaka, and all of St. Joseph County. We now have the strongest possible base on which to build a still better life for all the residents of our area.

In human terms our recovery is especially impressive. And it is this fact about our comeback—its effect on the lives of thousands of workers and businessmen and their families—that is for those of us who have worked long and hard for this recovery—private citizens and public officials alike—the greatest source of pride and satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that other communities in the United States which have the misfortune to lose a major industry will benefit from studying the South Bend story. It proves with certainty that Federal, State, and local governments and community leaders can work efficiently and effectively together in time of crisis.

ROADWAY LIGHTING FOR THE MOTORIST

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, night use of the multibillion-dollar motor vehicle transportation facilities in the United States have been seriously retarded by a delay in the use of appropriate roadway lighting. Low, poor, or mediocre visibility restricts the expanding benefits as contained in our Interstate Highway System and the numerous expressways that are being built in every section of the country. So states Charles Rex, roadway lighting engineer, of Hendersonville, N.C.

Vision is by far the most important sensory process involved in driving and, with 30 percent of the automobile travel occurring at night—210 billion miles last year—it is only logical that satisfactory illumination facilities be made available for the motoring public.

Added value and increased night use of the tremendous national investment in streets and highways will result from the application of appropriate roadway lighting. Add to this the fact that the livelihood, general welfare, social and economic progress of millions of citizens is dependent on efficient and safe movement of people and goods after dark—and we soon recognize the universal obligation that exists in this field.

Effectiveness ratings for the benefits which the American public expects from roadway lighting may be summed up as follows:

First. Increased value of automotive-highway investment.

Second. Night transportation to operate more safely and efficiently.

Third. Proportionate decreases in crime occurrences.

Fourth. Better environment for social, recreational, and business activities.

Fifth. Increased development of useful land areas.

Sixth. An improved standard of night living for those who drive at night.

Thus, proper lighting offers a sound solution to the night accident problem and, as a bonus, contributes materially to the reduction of crime on our streets and highways.

We need more application of techniques that are known to reduce night accidents. We must make the driving public more knowledgeable regarding after-dark operation of a motor vehicle. Above all, engineers and automobile designers must continue to research more effective and economical means of obtaining better illumination.

HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION, OCTOBER 1956

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, last November, when I visited Hungary, everywhere I saw the Russian soldiers in complete control of these poor people, and my mind turned back to October 1956, when thousands of Hungarians, fleeing the Red terror, came to Camp Kilmer as refugees.

The Hungarian revolt was one of the most thrilling, heartbreaking, and awe-inspiring events of our lifetime. Thrilling, because it was unequivocal proof that communism was objectionable and unbearable to freedom-loving people. Heartbreaking, because of the destruction and massacre wrought by Soviet and Communist forces on the population of Hungary. Around 30,000 Hungarians were killed; 200,000 fled in search of refuge. Awe-inspiring, because virtually unarmed and unprepared, the valiant Hungarians fought for 7 days against suicidal, insurmountable odds.

Seldom in history has man been so sorely tested—his beliefs, principles, and desires so magnificently demonstrated. To stand before those of you who participated in or were tragically affected by that outcry for human dignity and liberty does indeed fill me with the deepest awe and respect. Time, 10 years' worth, I am sure has not erased, nor even diminished, the images, the emotions, the terror, the exhilaration, or the agony in your memory. Forgive me if my words should unintentionally insult that memory, for as a nonparticipant I will never be able to share the full realization of the significance of that event to you as an individual or to Hungary as a nation.

The Hungarian revolt had great significance for the entire world, not only because it was a tragic contribution to man's historic struggle for independence and freedom, but also because it gave a true picture of Communist oppression. The revolt of the Hungarian people was not a planned revolution. It grew almost spontaneously from the seeds of discontent—a discontent resulting from the gap that existed between Communist promises and reality. World communism has never recovered from the blow that revolt dealt to its image. For the Hungarians demonstrated to the world that communism had been superimposed on them, but not accepted by them; they focused world attention on the actual and abominable Soviet motives and on the atrocious Soviet use of force against a virtually defenseless people. Whatever attraction the Communist system had held for the developing nations was greatly lessened. Communism was stripped of its idealistic camouflage, bared to reveal the tyranny it is in essence.

There were several sociological aspects of that revolt, which were in contradistinction to Communist theory. First, it was an expression of nationalism—for a Hungary free from Soviet intervention. In Communist theory, the state should disappear; logically, national boundaries should cease to exist, nationalism should cease to exist in a unified Communist community. Two of the major groups, leading and participating in the revolt, were the students and the workers. Hungary had been under Soviet domination for 11 years. The Communists had had 11 years in which to indoctrinate the youth, yet the revolt began with a peaceful student demonstration. The workers, the proletariat which was to be the ruling class in Marxist theory, the inheritors of the state, revolted out of frustration. They fought against the Communists whose promises were unfulfilled; they fought for the very rights which Communist doctrine had assured them, for the benefits which had never materialized. There were representatives from every realm of Hungarian society, joined together in rebellion against Soviet depredations. How sparse were the roots of communism the Soviets had transplanted in Hungarian soil.

Neither the revolt, which was an expression of the will of the people, nor the adverse world reaction, deterred the

Soviet Union from its inexcusable course of action. Its horrendous crushing of the revolt was a prime example of man's capacity for inhumanity to man. It was a testament of the despicability to which man can resort.

The aftermath of the revolt has meant a further subjugation of the brave Hungarians. Even 10 years later the Soviet Union finds it necessary to maintain over 85,000 troops in Hungary in order to insure Communist domination in Hungary. In February of this year the Communists jailed hundreds of known former participants in the 1956 revolt. This was a preemptive measure against a possible resurgence of rebellion in commemoration of the anniversary of the revolt. The Hungarians have only been granted token liberties by the Communists over the past 10 years. In reality, the Hungarians are still being subjected to persecution and enslavement. They are still being denied their basic rights, their national existence, their freedom for which they paid such an exorbitant toll.

Today, on the anniversary of their revolt, Americans of all descents identify with the Hungarian people, joining them in prayer for their eventual liberation. Our hearts ache as we recall the abortive end to which their revolt came. Your identification is more immediate and infinitely more cognizant of their unbearable fate. For their heritage is yours, their suffering yours, their enslavement yours. There are bonds between you and your native soil and fellow countrymen which will never be severed. Nor would we as Americans want those bonds severed. We are proud that we could offer you safety. The United States came into existence because of men similar to you, men in quest of freedom, liberty, basic rights, and safety from oppression. That you remain here by choice is in itself an endorsement of the American way of life. We are proud that from this base of strength in freedom, you have continued in your endeavors to lend support to those Hungarians still under foreign domination. Today, all Americans wish you success in your endeavors, lend their support to yours, and hope for a hasty liberation of your nation and your brave countrymen who remain under the yoke of communism.

TIME REMAINING FOR GENERAL DEBATE ON ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining for general debate on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] has 53 minutes remaining and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] has 49 minutes remaining.

SCHOOL BUSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of Federal control of education and its dangers to the traditional American system of home rule education has never been more dramatically presented than in the question of federally induced school busing.

Recent revelations show that the administration in Washington is planning a Federal program which will induce and encourage our local areas to bus pupils across district lines for the sole purpose of obtaining some type of racial balance in school systems.

I recently had occasion to comment on this in my "Washington Watch" of September 26, and wish to set this out for my colleagues in Congress.

The Johnson-Humphrey administration is drafting legislation to start a federally directed multibillion-dollar national school busing program. Your tax dollars are to be used to carry it out.

Of all the ideas proposed to help the American Negro achieve equality of opportunity, the idea of busing schoolchildren for long distances is the most self-defeating.

Its justification is hard to understand and I doubt if any significant number of parents, whether they be white or black, wish to see their children transported across long distances to school. The neighborhood school has the same appeal as the corner store, the local church, or the community outing. It is traditionally American—not black or white—and it has worked well.

Better education and improved schools will really help children.

More and more civil rights leaders now realize that the busing issue is distracting attention from this important goal.

The Johnson-Humphrey proposal is for a federally sponsored areawide rezoning of schools, without regard to existing lines, to compel and force racial balance in public schools. This includes busing of suburban schoolchildren to city schools at Federal expense.

The dangers of excessive Federal control over education now becomes a clear and present danger. Federal money always means some sort of Federal control, but that control should be reasonable and should be minimized.

My proposal to return directly a portion of Federal income to the States for educational purposes would be a step in the right direction. It would cut down redtape and help educational control in State and local hands. It would stop the nameless and faceless persons in Washington from planning to give our children an unnecessary bus ride which will get longer, more futile, and more expensive with each passing year.

The unnecessary busing of children should not be forced on any child, regardless of race. As one who believes and votes for equal opportunity, I cannot see any constructive purpose in a program that is equal only because it punishes white and black children alike.

I do not want to hurt them, equally or otherwise, but I want to help them attain a better education in better schools as near to their homes as possible. I think the light of exposure and the fresh air of public discusion is all that is necessary to assure that this matter will remain a local responsibility.

I attended the hearings before the House Rules Committee in which Commissioner Howe testified concerning this proposal. I was shocked to find a Democratic member of the Rules Committee charging that the hearings were a "political inquisition." How a Democratically controlled committee investigating a Democratic department of a Democratic administration could be engaging in a "political inquisition" is still unclear to me. Nevertheless, the charge was repeatedly made.

During the course of these hearings Commissioner Howe stated clearly that it was not his duty to force integration in any school district in the Nation. Nevertheless, he similarly testified that his Department is presently approving programs which supply Federal funds for school busing and other purposes to encourage just such a result. Although the Commissioner repeatedly stated that it was not the intention of the proposed new bill to force any school district to bus its pupils, he did not and could not deny that the lure of large amounts of Federal funds to do just that would, in fact, interfere with local control and decisionmaking processes.

In the October 10 issue of U.S. News & World Report, on page 76, an article appears entitled "Government's Plan To Desegregate the Suburbs." This article clearly reviews the present trend of administration thinking which is to use U.S. funds to break down present school district lines and get metropolitan area school district lines established with long-range school busing. The article goes on to explain:

> A major weapon in the new approach to desegregation of suburbs would be granting or denying a Federal subsidy to local communities. This power would reside largely in the Office of the Commissioner of Education.

The clear intent of title II of the so-called equal education opportunity bill sets up a program of Federal aid for school construction but, quite clearly, the only way a community gets such aid is to tie it in with one of the busing or pairing schemes under title III or to surrender school districting control throughout an entire metropolitan area. The following are the plans specifically proposed to revamp education throughout the United States.

First. School busing.

Second. Redistricting of school districts to achieve racial balance.

Third. Pairing of schools.

Fourth. Suburban and slum pupil exchanges.

Fifth. Revision of school textbooks on behalf of minority groups.

All this in spite of the clear direction of the Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which says:

> Nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve racial balance—

And which also contains these words:

Desegregation means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

It is apparent the administration is trying to circumvent the clear direction of Congress. It is further apparent that the hand of Congress must be strengthened if this is to be stopped.

The shocking fact is that such a proposed 1967 equal education opportunity bill does exist and has already been drafted and submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for consideration for submission to the 90th Congress next year.

Fortunately, this draft legislation came to the attention of some Republican Members of the House of Representatives who made it available to the general public for examination. I am setting out herewith title II and III of the proposed bill. As can be seen, this does not propose to order any school district to comply but it does hold forth as national policy financial inducements of substantial amounts to encourage school districts to bus their children and enlarge and merge school districts for racial purposes.

Recent testimony by Commissioner Harold Howe, Office of Education, denying that the Federal Government intends to force school districts to do this is, of course, a clear evasion of the intent of his Department. It is not claimed that the Federal Government will at this time attempt to actually order such busing to take place. It is, however, obvious that the Department intends to do everything in its power to see that such a result is obtained and that as many school districts as possible will, in fact, bus their children across school district lines.

The bill follows:

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1967—DETAILED EXPLANATION AND JUSTIFICATION

TITLE II: CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

Purpose

To help meet the pressing need for modern school facilities, especially in central cities and rural areas where outmoded facilities exist in conjunction with high concentrations of disadvantaged children. The program is aimed particularly at the facilitation of more flexible educational programs, in conjunction with educational innovations such as those supplementary services and arrangements which can be funded under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In addition, reduction of de facto segregation would be encouraged by combining grants under this title with the extra-cost grants for construction projects designed to achieve integrated education under title III of this legislative package.

Program

a. Survey of construction needs by State agency: Grants for an initial inventory of facilities would first be made so that within the first 6 to 9 months of the program a complete and reliable inventory of educational facility needs would be available. This inventory would then form the basis for establishing priorities as to the areas of greatest need within each State before the project approval process begins.

b. Basic grants for construction projects: These grants would build an estimated 110,000 classrooms over a 5-year period. Funds would be allotted among the States on the basis of relative per capita income and State educational effort. The basic grant could not ordinarily exceed 50 percent of the cost of construction.

c. Administration of grants: State educational agencies would assign priorities to project applications on the basis of objective need criteria, with preference for projects designed to alleviate segregation or racial imbalance. The Commissioner of Education would have final approval authority before a project could be funded under this title.

d. Supplementary grants: Supplementary grants providing an additional 20 percent of the project cost would be made to projects which fit into metropolitan area plans. This increased Federal share would provide an incentive for joint school district planning in metropolitan areas. This proposal is patterned after the proposed supplementary grants for planned metropolitan development contained in title II of the Senate-passed "Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966" (S. 3708). If enacted into law, that legislation could simply be amended to include school construction projects assisted under this proposed program in the definition of an eligible "metropolitan development project" in the same manner as libraries assisted under the Library Services and Construction Act and hospitals assisted under the Public Health Service Act are covered in the pending legislation. The location and scope of educational parks should be an important component of any comprehensive metropolitan areawide planning.

e. Loans: While outright grants should be restricted to special construction needs which impose heavy burdens upon the resources of local educational agencies and the States, the Federal government can, with minimum budgetary impact, assist schools which undertake to spread out the cost of constructing facilities by facilitating the marketing of long-term bonds and by lowering the interest rate for local educational agencies. For example, rapidly expanding middle-income communities are in a better position to afford the construction of needed school facilities than other areas, but the rapid development of an area does impose a fairly sudden impact of school-age children. While able to afford the facilities, such communities nevertheless find it desirable to spread the cost over a long period of time.

Furthermore, even in the case of projects which do receive Federal grants for a share of the cost of construction, few construction projects will be funded without requiring substantial local funds. Accordingly, in most cases, a part of the cost of most projects will have to be obtained by borrowing. The maximum maturity of school bonds—the spread-out period—is rather short compared to the long-term loans which institutions of higher education can obtain under the Higher Education Facilities Act and the College Housing Program.

In addition, the interest rate on school bonds is now significantly higher than the "ideal" of 3 percent.

It is therefore recommended that a school bond support program be devised using the procedures of the Federal National Mortgage Association. FNMA may now issue debentures to secure funds from private investors with which to purchase home mortgages in its secondary market operations at a ratio of 15 times its capital and reserves (i.e., the net cost is one-fifteenth of the mortgage purchased). In view of the similar ratio on the sale of participation certificates in Federal loans (a 5 percent reserve, or a 20-to-1 ratio of loans to net cost), a special fund or account could be administered by FNMA through which school bonds would be purchased out of funds secured by the sale of FNMA obligations equal to 20 times the appropriations deposited in the fund. The net cost to the Federal Government would be one-twentieth of the total amount of such school construction loans, assuming a 5 percent reserve requirement.

As an additional part of the program, the Commissioner of Education would be authorized to make payments on behalf of the local educational agencies for that portion of the interest necessary to make up the difference between a 3 percent rate of interest and the rate which FNMA must pay on its outstanding debentures which provided the funds for the purchase of the school bonds.

Funding	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972
Basic grants	----------	$930,000	$1,108,000	$1,284,000	$1,274,000
Loans	----------	200,000	100,000	100,000	----------
Supplemental grants	----------	120,000	140,000	160,000	160,000
State administration (including inventory in fiscal year 1968)	$57,000	10,000	11,000	13,000	13,000
Research	----------	10,000	11,000	13,000	13,000
Total	57,000	1,270,000	1,370,000	1,570,000	1,460,000

TITLE III: GRANTS TO ASSIST SCHOOLS IN THE PROCESS OF DESEGREGATION

Purpose

To assist communities throughout the Nation to cope with problems of segregation and racial imbalance in order to facilitate racial, ethnic and socio-economic integration.

Program

a. Educational excellence grants: Local educational agencies would be eligible for Federal grants to assist in achieving integrated education. On the assumption that integrated education involved added costs to accommodate educationally disadvantaged students, Federal grants would be offered to schools which have few or no students from minority racial or ethnic groups in order to facilitate educational integration and reduce educational disparities. As one alternative, a formula similar to that in the impact aid program (with a per pupil Federal payment multiplied by the increased number of children in integrated schools for 5 years) would provide a real incentive for schools to desegregate completely over a 5-year period.

Federal grants would be offered to school districts for use in specific neighborhoods which show promise of being able to maintain integrated education (such as Hyde Park in Chicago) or to achieve integration by attracting white students to exceptional schools currenly serving predominantly Negro residential areas (including appropriate schools in urban renewal areas). The grants may be used to produce exceptional education programs, attractive to parents of all races, by supporting, *inter alia*, superior salaries for master teachers, improved instructional equipment, lighted schoolhouse-community centers for around-the-clock superior

programs, stipends for visiting lecturers, individualized instruction, and reduced pupil-teacher ratios.

b. In addition to expanding training institutes to prepare local school personnel to deal with problems of racial imbalance as well as de jure segregation, title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 would be amended to provide grants to support techniques appropriate to correct *de facto* segregation in individual communities. Such techniques could include:

1. Comprehensive, district-wide rezoning of school attendance areas to obtain maximum heterogeneity.

2. Pairing, grouping or clustering or adjacent Negro and white schools a division by grade level in two or more residential areas.

3. Reorganization of the use of schools; reorganizing the grades of a school; converting schools to other uses; closing schools; changing feeder patterns; grade pattern reorganization.

4. Careful site selection to locate new schools so as to maximize integration of residentially segregated student populations.

5. Increased bussing from overcrowded to underutilized schools.

6. Development of "magnet" high schools, each specializing in a different subject area with enrollment open to the entire school district on the basis of interest rather than ability.

7. Development of supplemental educational centers, comprehensive community schools and shared time programs to draw district-wide enrollment as well as participation from private and parochial schools.

8. Open enrollment, voluntary enrollment and free transfers.

9. Creation of metropolitan school districts to include urban and suburban areas.

10. Suburban-Inner City pupil exchanges.

11. In-class pupil grouping to avoid racial separation, development of ungraded primary classes; remedial and compensatory programs within the framework of regular classroom structure.

12. Inservice training for teachers and other school personnel; employment of specialists to advise school personnel, parents, children and the public on problems of desegregation; improving guidance and counselling services.

13. Development of new curricular materials, particularly those including proper representation or racial and religious minorities.

14. Teacher assignment to assure faculty integration at all schools.

15. Improvement of recruitment and advancement of minority group teachers and of white teachers who are motivated to teach in ghetto schools and in transitional programs.

c. Extra-cost grants for construction to achieve integration: Grants would be made by the Commissioner of Education (not allocated by State) to meet the extra costs of constructing new schools, including special education centers and educational parks and complexes located on the borders of ghettos under plans insuring interracial attendance of students.

Insofar as the acquisition of large blocks of land and the construction methods are more expensive than the conventional school facility the Federal government should cover 100 percent of the difference. Preference would be given to multiple school district applications, especially those joining suburban and core-city districts.

Funding

[In thousands]

Fiscal year 1968	175,000
Fiscal year 1969	275,000
Fiscal year 1970	375,000
Fiscal year 1971	375,000
Fiscal year 1972	375,000

Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1967

[In millions of dollars]

	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
I. Grants to local education agencies for self-assessment, planning, and evaluation	75	75	75	75	75
II. Construction of school facilities	57	1,270	1,370	1,570	1,460
III. Grants to assist schools in the process of desegregation	175	275	375	375	375
IV. Educational personnel training and staff development	25	40	50	60	60
V. Expanded pupil personnel services [1]	5	5	10	14	25
VI. Educational programs for adults	15	50	150	200	250
Total	352	1,715	2,030	2,294	2,245

[1] Amounts represent increases in the funding authorization of title V-A of NDEA; no specific funds would be earmarked for the additional pupil personnel services authorized.

This is an exact copy of the detailed bill now under consideration by the Johnson-Humphrey administration.

On October 6, 1966, the Republican Coordinating Committee issued a statement to the effect that "our schools should not be directed from Washington." This statement pointed out the dangers in the enormous powers given to the Commissioner of Education to establish criteria for Federal aid under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. It called for congressional action to eliminate unauthorized Federal dictation.

This will have my support and must be done. If not by this Congress, then certainly by a new Congress next year which is responsive to the will of the people.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further 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. 17788. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17788) entitled "An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. KUCHEL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15111) entitled "An act to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty," 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. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of New York; Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. NELSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. MURPHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15963) entitled "An act to establish a Department of Transportation, 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. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. CURTIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCMILLAN (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. HICKS, for the week beginning October 10, on account of district business.

Mr. DYAL (at the request of Mr. MOSS), from October 4 through the balance of the week, 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. WYDLER (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARSH (at the request of Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI), for 60 minutes, on October 11; and to revise and extend his remarks and 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. RHODES of Arizona.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. QUILLEN and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $302.50.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. BELL to include extraneous matter in remarks made in the Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in two instances.

Mr. ICHORD.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. BANDSTRA.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa.

Mr. REDLIN.

Mr. MATTHEWS.

Mr. JOELSON.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5912. An act for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band;

H.R. 9916. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 16559. An act 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.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 491. An act to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes;

S. 2070. An act to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of South Dakota at Rapid City; and

S. 3433. An act to make it a criminal offense to steal, embezzle, or otherwise unlawfully take property from a pipeline, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 6, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2784. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of certain surplus property intended to be donated to the U.S.S. *Massachusetts* Memorial Committee, Inc., pursuant to the provisions of section 7545 of title 10, U.S.C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2785. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting notice of an estimated cost increase of a certain construction project for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves authorized in section 701(2) of Public Law 88-390, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2786. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on procurement of thrust vector control nozzles for the Minuteman missile program, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2787. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2788. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) was exercised, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2789. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the legislative branch and the executive branch of the Government for the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 (H. Doc. No. 505); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

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. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12822. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1028. Resolution providing fund for the Committee on House Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 2187). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1029. Resolution providing an additionary stationery allowance for Members of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 2188). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1034. Resolution that the amount of $15,000, authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House by House Resolution 241, agreed to February 24, 1965, on vouchers authorized by the committee on arrangements for the centennial anniversary of the second inaugural of Abraham Lincoln, incurred pursuant to Public Law 88-427, approved August 14, 1964, is increased to $30,000; with amendment (Rept. No. 2189). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 18019. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct an addition at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. S. 3500. An act to authorize the President to advance Maj. Gen. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., to the grade of lieutenant general; without amendment (Rept. No. 2191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 16000. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. Senate Joint Resolution 153. Joint resolution to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Federal land bank system in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 16923. A bill to provide for the striking of a medal in commemoration of the designation of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York City, N.Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 18190. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 18191. 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. DOWNING:

H.R. 18192. A bill to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 18193. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Plymouth Rock National Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 18194. A bill to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 18195. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 18196. A bill to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 18197. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 18198. A bill to authorize the merger of two or more professional football leagues, and to protect football contests between secondary schools from professional football telecasts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 18199. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 18200. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 18201. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 18202. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 18203. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 18204. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 18205. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 18206. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 18207. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 18208. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 18209. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 18210. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 18211. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a farmer shall have until March 15 (instead of only until February 15 as at present) to file an income tax return which also satisfies the requirements relating to declarations of estimated tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 18212. A bill to establish a Commission to review the Federal income tax structure and recommend revisions to redistribute the burden of taxes so as to remove inequities adversely affecting the middle-income family in America; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 18213. A bill to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 18214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the treatment of certain real property acquired by foreclosure and subdivided for sale; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 18215. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 18216. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 18217. A bill to provide home leave for Federal seafaring personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 18218. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 194) so as to clarify the duty of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House in certifying reports of contempts under section 102 of such Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.J. Res. 1314. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 1029. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to certain agreements which would necessitate the modification of duties or other import restrictions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RACE:

H. Con. Res. 1030. Concurrent resolution relating to diet foods and supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 1031. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of 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. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 1032. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the worldwide conservation of wildlife and the convening in 1968 of an international conference on the conservation of wildlife; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H. Res. 1042. Resolution providing for the removal of certain employees of the House of Representatives whose employment is in violation of law; 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. CHELF:

H.R. 18219. A bill for the relief of Surjeet Singh Dhanjal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 18220. A bill for the relief of Sun On Ng, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 18221. A bill for the relief of Phillip H. Kass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 18222. A bill for the relief of Stanislawa Gurdak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 18223. A bill for the relief of Chang-You Wu, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Tribute to Business and Professional Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, during the week of October 16 we shall commemorate the annual observance of National Business Women's Week; a time when we pay tribute to and recognize the many contributions of women to business and professional life.

Only when we recognize that women comprise a third of today's labor force and that most of the increase has occurred since World War II, can we realize the tremendous advances women have made in every segment of our society. The doors to every profession have been opened to women in recent years, largely through their own determined efforts. However, there are still many challenges to be met and dealt with. Today, women doctors, lawyers, scientists, and business executives are making lasting contributions to their respective fields, but such organizations as the National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs—B. & P.W.—still perform yeoman service in their endeavors to elevate the status of women.

The B. & P.W. club has chapters in every State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. With over 177,000 members, it is promoting the interests of business and professional women who have organized to extend opportunities to an even greater number of women at every level. Through its scholarships and awards, it gives many young women the opportunity to fulfill their ambitions in the business and professional community. The spirit of cooperation and understanding which the B. & P.W. has advanced among working women is illustrative of what can be accomplished by a determined organization with a worthwhile purpose.

I certainly want to commend the efforts of this outstanding group, and during this week which is dedicated to publicizing the achievements of business and professional women everywhere, it is with admiration that I extend my best wishes. The true pioneer spirit displayed by the women in B. & P.W. is in the best traditions of our American heritage. With a renewed vigor toward