FIRST RUBBER CONVEYOR BELT

Thomas Robins, Sr., had worked with Thomas A. Edison in developing the first rubber conveyor belt which was made by the New York Belting & Packing Co. Robins then became Manhattan's first secretary and continued his belt conveyor development with them. Robins later founded the Robins Conveying Belt Co. in Passaic in 1896. This company later became Hewitt-Robins with the acquisition of Hewitt Rubber Co., of Buffalo, and today it is a division of Litton. Thomas Matchett was president of both Robins Conveying Belt and Hewitt Rubber before they merged.

TELEVISION DEVELOPED IN PASSAIC

It was in part of the Brighton Mills plant in Passaic, partly idled after moving south, that Dr. Lee DeForest of DeForest Radio Co., with Du Mont, perfected the TV tube and gave us the TV industry. This plant, adjacent to Manhattan Rubber, was acquired by Manhattan about this time.

INDUSTRIAL PIONEERS OF PASSAIC

Some of the pioneers behind the great development of the Passaic area are: Peter Reid and William I. Barry, both founders of Reid & Barry, the first large textile finishing plant on the Dundee Canal, and did much to spur the great industrial expansion of Passaic and both were generous community contributors, including the Reid Public Library; Richard Morrell, founded Campbell, Morrell Co., at one time largest State dealers in coal, grain, and building material, had eastern agency for Erie anthracite coal, built railroad from Dundee mills to Passaic Junction of N.Y.S. & W.R.R. in Bergen County; Gilbert D. Bogart, owner of large part of Garfield, named it, and helped develop it and other areas; R. D. Benson, late president of Tide Water Oil Co., first oil and pipeline company, organized Passaic and county park systems, helped on boards of several large local companies; W. F. Gaston, prominent lawyer who helped organize and manage large companies here—Manhattan Rubber, Okonite, New York Steam Engine Co., Forstmann, others—Frank Hughes, developed industrial property and brought in new industries, developed Athenia, most of which his father owned, and other areas.

Of the more contemporary ones: Julius G. Forstmann, built large integrated woolen mills in Passaic, Clifton, and Garfield employing thousands, very large community contributor and endowed Forstmann Public Library; Dow H. Drukker, Congressman, publisher, builder, banker, and on boards of large local plants; Paul L. Troast, president, Mahony-Troast Construction Co., was chairman of New Jersey Tercentenary Commission, headed New Jersey Turnpike Commission, Chairman S. H. Kress & Co., chairman of New Jersey Manufacturers Association, member of Governors Commission for More South American Trade, made close run for Governor. There were many others, like Paulison, Kip, Howe, and so forth, and others of earlier periods who did magnificent work under conditions difficult to evaluate with today's era, and there are many contemporary outstanding performers in public affairs, industry employing thousands, finance, law, some of big deeds, very large benefactors and community contributors, but space does not permit.

HOUSING PROBLEMS

This great industrial expansion created housing and rooming problems. In addition to many thousands of immigrants, many young men out of school came here to seek their fortunes. To take care of them, rooming and boarding houses were set up almost everywhere, many by upstate farmers or from small rural towns. There were also several housekeeping "bachelor clubs," two of which became famous as the young men came from well-to-do families from different parts of the country. They rotated purchasing and managing, had a cook or housekeeper and gardener. They became favorites at the ball or for whist. Many became responsible and influential executives, like C. T. Young, to vice president, the Manhattan Rubber Manufacturing Co., and F. L. Curtis to vice president of Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc., B. M. Mitchell, who founded the Conveying Weigher Co. and designed the first long-distance belt conveyor systems for construction, like the Wanaque Reservoir Dam, Stamford, Conn., reservoir, Conowingo Dam, George Washington Bridge colossal anchorages, and other executives many with equal accomplishments.

RELIGIOUS AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS

This expansion necessitated worship and recreational facilities, which were accomplished very well. Passaic has some of the largest and most elegant churches in the State of all denominations. It has two of the finest endowed libraries, also has YMCA and YWCA buildings among the State's largest and best equipped. All of these possible through generous public contributions and sizable endowments, both industrial and publicly, all made possible through the fruits of industry. It also has three large and complete hospitals that serve the entire Passaic area and beyond because of specialized facilities. Because of Passaic's early growth, it has become virtually the civic and commercial center of a wide peripheral territory. Passaic schools at one time had the highest scholastic standing in the Nation.

The boom conditions experienced manifested themselves in other directions. The Passaic Fire Department was the first in the country to be completely motorized; that is, no more horses, and shortly before, Passaic had its own trolley car line operating entirely within its boundaries, the first in the State, and again, no more horses.

WILLIAM W. SCOTT

In conclusion, I should like to express a deep sense of gratitude to William W. Scott for writing the history of Passaic and its environs from which much of the early data above has been taken. It was written after middle age and during a time when many old residents were still alive and able to give firsthand data on early events, or they themselves had known oldtimers who had direct or eyewitness information of their times, even to the Revolutionary period, and were able to provide Scott with documentary material they had preserved.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Commit thy works unto the Lord, and thy thoughts shall be established." Proverbs 16: 3.

Eternal Father of our spirits, as we bow before the altar of prayer, grant unto us a realization of Thy presence and the assurance that as we face the demanding duties of these days Thou art with us. As we turn to Thee, may we find wisdom to make wise decisions, strength to stand for what is good for all, and good will to motivate all our endeavors.

May we think of Thee—not only this moment—but throughout this day, and from these moments may there come a confidence and a courage which will enable us to lead our Nation to better days, to a greater spirit between our people and to a finer relationship between the nations of the world.

We pause to thank Thee for our companion who has fallen along the way. Receive him into Thy everlasting glory and may the comfort of Thy presence and the strength of Thy spirit abide in the hearts of his beloved family. In the Master'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 joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution extending the dates for transmission of the Economic Report and the report of the Joint Economic Committee; and

S.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution authorizing the President to establish a "National Ski Week."

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 88–630, appointed Mr. HANSEN as a member of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission in lieu of Mr. Simpson, retired from the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 85–874, appointed Mr. PERCY as a member of the National Cultural Center Board in lieu of Mr. Saltonstall, retired from the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

81–754, appointed Mr. PELL as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission in lieu of Mr. Saltonstall, retired from the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 89–81, appointed Mr. KUCHEL as a member of the Joint Commission on the Coinage in lieu of Mr. Saltonstall, retired from the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 79–304, appointed Mr. SYMINGTON and Mr. PERCY as members of the Joint Economic Committee.

THE REDWOODS—OUR FOREMOST CONSERVATION ISSUE

Mr. COHELAN. 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. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the single most important piece of conservation legislation to come before this or any recent session of Congress is the proposal to establish a Redwood National Park. Today, along with 33 of our colleagues, I am reintroducing a bill to establish a 90,000-acre park in the Redwood Creek area of northern California.

This plan would preserve the last significant section of unprotected virgin coast redwoods.

It is in the area recommended as most desirable for preservation by the National Park Service in its landmark 1963–64 study and report on the redwoods. It would establish a park that is truly worthy of this great and unique resource. I believe its consideration should be foremost on our agenda of unfinished conservation business.

An unfinished business quite properly characterizes the redwoods, Mr. Speaker. Bills to establish a Redwood National Park have been before the Congress intermittently since 1911. But until now they have uniformly been frustrated.

It is certainly appropriate for the greatest deliberative body in the world to subject a major addition to our national park system to the most careful scrutiny, including the test of time. But many years have now gone by, and time is no longer on the side of the redwoods.

The original redwood forest covered almost 2 million acres. Today only 10 percent or less of that original forest remains.

The depletion of the redwoods occurred mostly because the land was allowed to pass into private ownership before its value to the Nation was fully recognized. Now only 485 acres of redwood forest land in the Muir Woods National Monument just north of San Francisco is administered by the National Park Service. Some 50,000 acres of virgin stands, it is true, are protected in California State parks, but this acreage, unfortunately, is badly scattered. Nowhere is a major block of virgin forest presently preserved where the entire growing range of the species can be represented.

Such an area does, however, exist. In 1963, the National Geographic Society made a grant to the National Park Service to finance a survey of the coast redwoods. This exhaustive study concluded with the recommendation that the Redwood Creek Valley and certain adjacent lands be established as a national park.

Let me quote briefly from the Park Service's report:

> To add bits and pieces here and there will not do the job. A major addition is required and one preferably which would not add merely size, but high quality redwood groves and forests in a situation where they can be preserved and made available to the public in an outstanding manner.

And the report continues—

> Just south of Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park and east of Orrick, the Redwood Creek and Lost Man Creek drainages contain what is apparently the largest uncut block of virgin growth not preserved—certainly the most significant block in terms of park values.

This area, I want to point out, is what would be preserved in the 90,000-acre park bill which we are introducing today.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that time is no longer on the side of preserving virgin redwoods. In 1965, some 15,000 acres of redwood giants fell to the woodsman's ax and chain saw. The average annual cutting for the preceding 5 years was just short of 1 billion board feet.

Those who caution further delay in establishing a park argue that a moratorium now protects the redwoods. But this moratorium is a fragile one. It is voluntary. It can be broken at any time, and there are indications that it may be before this year is over. Furthermore, this moratorium is far from complete. Ruinous cutting continues to go on in areas that have been strongly recommended and backed for preservation.

The National Park Service has pointed out that it takes a thousand years or more to grow mature trees, and once cut much longer still to establish a climax forest, if indeed that is now possible at all.

In a matter of only 2 or 3 more years, if the past rate of cutting is resumed, no unprotected redwood area of sufficient ecological or recreational integrity will remain that is worth being preserved in a national park.

So let us be very clear that the time for action is short. The time for leisurely discussion and further prolonged study is past. The opportunity, now ours, will not present itself to another generation.

Just as important as early action, Mr. Speaker, is the question of where this park should be located. In my judgment, it is no less critical to establish a Redwood National Park in the proper place as it is to establish it at all.

The fact is that only in the drainages of Redwood and Little Lost Man Creeks in northern Humboldt County of California can all of the essential characteristics for an adequate Redwood National Park still be found.

This area offers the largest concentration of virgin redwoods outside any existing State park.

It offers the world's tallest trees in a setting that would provide them with adequate protection.

It offers a wide variety of wildlife, outstanding natural features such as Fern Canyon, and the striking Gold Bluffs which stretch along the Pacific Ocean for 11 miles.

It offers an area of sufficient size and varied attractions to accommodate a large number of visitors and to disperse them over a wide area.

The Mill Creek site, recommended by the administration a year ago, possesses none of these advantages.

It is true, as some of its advocates have pointed out, that the National Park Service did, at one time, recommend the Mill Creek Valley as the location for a national park. But that recommendation was made almost 30 years ago. It was made before logging operations had penetrated the valley and cut off much of the forest.

Today the situation is far different from that of 1937. Over half of the valley has been cut over. Logging roads have been pushed into every area. Logging, in fact, has gone so far that not a single streambed remains free from erosion, siltation, or choking debris.

I am not opposed to limited acquisition in the Mill Creek Valley. Neither am I opposed to providing any needed watershed protection for the beautiful Jedediah Smith State Park. But when the relative values are compared and considered, I think it is very clear that our major efforts should be concentrated in the valley of Redwood Creek and in the Lost Man Creek watersheds.

Mr. Speaker, there is a third proposal, of sorts, for a Redwood National Park. Not surprisingly, it was endorsed last week by California's new Governor who, in commenting on park plans less than a year ago stated:

> A trees's a tree. How many do you need to look at? See one, you've seen them all.

Unfortunately, this proposal misses the whole point of the need for a Redwood National Park.

It does not address itself at all to the major question, which is clearly preservation of the few important stands of unprotected virgin redwoods that remain today.

Relabeling three State parks does not accomplish this goal.

A postage-stamp-size unit around the tall trees on Redwood Creek will not guarantee their survival.

This plan would save practically no old-growth redwoods that are not already included in one of the scattered State parks, or that have not already been pledged for conservation.

It could more appropriately be called a plan for a new national seashore. Certainly in terms of a Redwood National Park it ignores practically everything of substance that needs saving.

Its backers have called it a "compromise plan." At best, it would be a compromise between little and nothing.

The Governor has now asked Congress to delay any action on a redwood park bill for at least 3 months. In light of his endorsement of the "seashore plan" there is reason to question whether his interests lie more with further study

or with delay to mount new opposition to any meaningful redwood park plan at all.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that the Sequoia sempervirens, the coastal redwoods of California, are among the most impressive of nature's achievements. Clearly they are the kind of resource which our great national park system was designed to protect and display.

It may be, at this time, that we cannot afford to purchase the whole 90,000-acre unit proposed in the bill being introduced today, even though the price tag approach is neither a sound nor a desirable basis for establishing a national park.

But, in accepting any necessary cost limitations, let us not settle for a second-best location. Let us not put whatever funds are available to a second-best use.

If we do not have the money now for a 90,000-acre park, let us not then desert the most desirable area. Let us trim where necessary but let us acquire the biggest and best park we can in the Redwood Creek and Lost Man Creek watersheds. For clearly, dollar for dollar, the values and opportunities for conservation are far greater here.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that we move ahead with a good first step in the first-choice location. Let us move ahead with the vision and determination which the preservation of this magnificent resource demands, and let us do it before it is too late.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT FUNDING FOR PROPOSED GIANT DESALTING PLANT

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, I am today introducing legislation to authorize a $57.2 million contribution by the Interior Department for building and operating the world's largest desalting and powerplant.

Similar bills have been offered by the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Mr. ASPINALL, and by the senior Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL.

The huge, nuclear-powered plant will rise on a manmade island off the southern California coast. When completed, it will purify enough sea water to supply an entire city the size of San Diego or San Francisco and produce more electricity than the Hoover Dam. A team of four California groups has agreed to pay more than 85 percent of the $443.3 million cost of the project.

I am especially proud of the role my district has played in helping advance the new and vital technology of desalinization. A federally funded desalting plant and test center is under construction in my district at Chula Vista. And the San Diego Gas & Electric Co., one of the four local entities ready to undertake the exciting new project, has extensive operations in the district.

The arrangements for planning, building and financing the offshore desalting-power complex are the direct result of a unique partnership between governmental and private agencies.

The anticipated Federal share of the total project costs will be $72.2 million, less that one-fifth the approximately $370 million to be provided by the San Diego Gas & Electric Co., the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the Department of Water & Power of the City of Los Angeles, and the Southern California Edison Co.

The Atomic Energy Commission already has been authorized to contribute $15 million toward construction of the facility. The remainder of the Federal contribution would come from the Interior Department under terms of the legislation my colleagues and I are proposing.

The dual purpose plant will be built in two major stages. It is hoped that the first stage, capable of producing 50 million gallons of fresh water a day, will be operational by 1972. By 1977, facilities for desalting an additional 100 million gallons a day should be available. The complex would have a total electrical output of 1,800 megawatts.

As its part of the project, the San Diego Gas & Electric Co. will join with Southern California Edison in building a nuclear steam supply system and an associated turbine generator.

This great undertaking will benefit all Americans, particularly those living in water-short areas.

SPECIAL TIME PROBLEM IN INDIANA SHOULD BE RESOLVED THROUGH LOCAL ACTION

Mr. ROUSH. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to allow the State of Indiana to continue to resolve its special time problem through local action.

Like some 11 other States, Indiana is divided into more than one time zone. The eastern section lies in the eastern standard time zone, as established by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The western section of the State is in the central standard time zone.

This division does not reflect economic realities or the customs of the areas involved. The problem was largely resolved as long as the State could determine whether or not and where daylight saving time would be adopted.

Some communities in c.s.t. chose to adopt e.s.t. or its equivalent "by the clock" because shopping and business interests allied them with cities in that time zone. Effectively, then, they had daylight time all year round. During the past year all of Indiana, except for a few counties in the far northwestern corner near Chicago—which is in c.s.t.—have observed e.s.t.

As of this April, however, the Uniform Time Act of 1966 nullifies this freedom of choice. All parts of a State must observe daylight time from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in October, unless the State legislature provides that none shall observe daylight or advanced time. Thus many communities must return to c.s.t. while about half the State must remain on e.s.t.; or both will adopt daylight time with the eastern section still 1 hour ahead of the western.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today will amend the Uniform Time Act to allow an option in the adoption of daylight time in certain cases, namely in the case of States whose parts are in different time zones, as in Indiana. According to my legislation, such a State will be able to exempt one or more such parts to suit their customs and convenience as well as economic necessities. Uniformity should not be the only criterion for an issue that so closely affects the lives of so many people.

CHANGING THE NAME OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES TO THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I have today introduced a resolution which would change the name of the Committee on Un-American Activities and also the wording of its mandate.

Comment will undoubtedly be made on the fact that a member of the committee has introduced such a resolution. I have no desire to speak at length on my resolution at this time. To avoid any mistaken interpretation of its intent on the part of anyone, however, I would like to make a few brief comments on it.

The point I would like to stress above all else is that my purpose in introducing this resolution is to preserve for the committee the full jurisdiction and all the powers it has possessed during the almost 29 years of its operation under its present mandate.

I have introduced this resolution not because I am opposed to the committee or to the areas in which it has made investigations in the past, but because it is my desire to strengthen the committee in every way possible, clarify its mandate and eliminate any possible misunderstanding and confusion about the specific powers and jurisdiction of the committee.

It is my view and intent that, with the authority of the mandate contained in my resolution, the Committee on Un-American Activities, renamed the Committee on Internal Security, will be empowered to investigate, first, all forms of Communist, Nazi, and Fascist activities in the United States; and, second, the activities of any other movements or groups now existing, or which may come into being in the future, whether domestic or foreign oriented, which by

force, violence, or any unlawful means, would attempt to undermine or subvert the form of Government guaranteed by our Constitution, impose upon this country any form of dictatorship, obstruct or impede the execution of any law or duly promulgated national policy affecting our internal security, or advance the interest of any foreign principal to the detriment of this country's internal security.

My intent and purpose in introducing this resolution is to confer on the new Committee on Internal Security the authority to investigate domestic or indigenous terrorist groups whose organized unlawful activities pose a threat, whether immediate or long-range and indirect, to the security of our form of Government by undermining the principles on which our Constitution is based.

Finally, I would like to state that, while I have discussed this resolution informally with other members of the Committee on Un-American Activities and have provided them with a copy of my resolution and these remarks, the resolution represents my thinking and does not, at this time, have committee approval.

PENALTIES FOR INTERFERENCE WITH DEFENSE SECURITY SYSTEMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in the 89th Congress I introduced a bill which would protect the security of the United States by providing penalties for interference with defense security systems. Due to the pressure of time the Congress did not take final action upon this proposal.

It is my feeling that it is imperative that affirmative action be taken to meet the possibility of interference with defense security systems. For that reason I am again introducing the legislation.

The following constitutes a brief description of the legislation and its purposes:

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide a specific statute for criminal prosecution of persons who willfully and maliciously activate, willfully or maliciously injure, or interfere with, or attempt to activate, injure, or interfere with, any defense alerting system.

Recent incidents at operational missile sites of the United States Air Force have highlighted the fact that existing statutes are inadequate to cope with willful or malicious acts that result in activating or in disrupting our military alerting or alarm systems. Unless the law is strengthened to deter such acts, the security of our nuclear missiles and other weapons systems could be seriously compromised. The mentioned incidents occurred at different times at different missile sites, but the facts are similar. Foreign objects were deliberately thrown over the outer security fence onto a sensitized surface area. This in turn caused the activation of an electronic alarm system, indicating to defense forces stationed some miles away that the secured area of the missile site had been penetrated. Armed mobile strike teams were immediately dispatched to the site by motor vehicle. The net result was that members of the strike team were subjected to unnecessary hazards and normal security operations were seriously disrupted.

Many military installations involving modern weapons systems occupy very small acreages, in remote dispersed locations that are not under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction of the United States. These installations are unique in that they are unmanned, and their safeguarding is dependent on uninterrupted surveillance by electronic devices and the use of mobile strike teams responding from distant locations. The considerable number of Minuteman missile sites which are operational are typical of these installations.

Increasing use is being made of electronic alarm and warning systems to supplement guard forces and to amplify their effectiveness. Interference with the proper and continuous operation of these electronic systems seriously impairs the effectiveness of security guard forces charged with the protection of nuclear and other weapons systems. Security guard forces must respond to all warning alarms, on the assumption that the alarms indicate an attempt to penetrate a security area and damage or interfere with the operations of a weapons system. False alarms, therefore, place an intolerable burden on those forces, and could result in their being unavailable for genuine emergency calls. In fact, it could reasonably be expected that persons intent on penetrating a missile site might use several false alarms as decoys to divert the attention of security guard forces from a site which is the real target for penetration.

In this connection, it should also be noted that in the future helicopters will be used to augment motor vehicles in transporting teams responding to control security alarms. Consequently, the disruptions to the security posture of our strike teams, the hazards to personnel, and the expenses generated by false alerts will be further aggravated.

Under current law, criminal prosecution for acts of this nature could be attempted under 18 U.S.C. 13, 1362, 1382, or 2155, or 50 U.S.C. 797. However, none of these existing criminal statutes offers a completely satisfactory vehicle for the prosecution of offenses involving false alarms.

18 U.S.C. 13 is the so-called Assimilative Crimes Act. Under that statute, and so far as here pertinent, acts or omissions which would be punishable under State law, if committed or omitted within the jurisdiction of that State, are, under certain conditions, punishable under Federal law if committed or omitted on Federal lands within that State. Those conditions are that the lands must have been reserved or acquired for the use of the United States and be under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof, or purchased or otherwise acquired by the United States, by consent of the State legislature, for the erection of a fort, magazine, arsenal, dockyard, or other needful building. However, criminal laws among the several States are not uniform, and in some cases cannot be construed to cover malicious activation of, or interference with, defense alarm systems. Furthermore, as noted above, many missile sites and defense installations are located on lands over which the United States does not exercise either exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction and which do not otherwise come within the purview of this statute. Accordingly, the Assimilative Crimes Act does not offer a solution to the problem.

18 U.S.C. 1362 provides criminal penalties for willful or malicious injury to, destruction of, or interference with communications lines, stations, or systems operated or controlled by the United States, or used or intended to be used for military or civil defense functions of the United States. However, it is questionable whether a security alarm system constitutes a "communications" system within the meaning of that statute, or whether, in the absence of physical damage, activation of an alarm system can be considered an "interference" under that statute.

18 U.S.C. 1382 provides criminal penalties for anyone who, contrary to the restrictions applicable thereto, "enters, remains in, leaves, or commits any act in any military area or zone . . . ." However, this statute does not by its terms, apply to a person who causes mischief from outside the military area or zone, as exemplified by the rock-throwing incidents, since he does not technically "enter" or commit an act "in" the area or zone.

18 U.S.C. 2155 provides criminal penalties for anyone who, with intent to injure, interfere with, or obstruct the national defense of the United States, willfully "injures, destroys, contaminates, or infects" any national-defense material, premises, or utilities. This statute likewise provides an ineffective vehicle for prosecution since it is unlikely that actual injury or destruction of material, premises, or utilities would be involved when defense security systems are maliciously activated.

50 U.S.C. 797 proscribes violations of security regulations promulgated or approved by the Secretary of Defense, any military commander designated by the Secretary of Defense, or the Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (now the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration), for the protection of certain types of installations and property. The regulations so promulgated must relate to specified matters, including (among other subjects) guard service, ingress to or egress from installations or property, and the safeguarding of installations or property against destruction, loss, or injury. However, the limited nature of the authority conferred by this statute makes it questionable that malicious activation of defense security systems could be covered.

It is therefore considered essential that a specific statute, directed to the problem of false security alarms, be enacted in order that, with appropriate publicity, warning systems at missile sites, aircraft alert areas, and other defense installations, can be protected from the malicious mischief of pranksters and vandals, and the security of our nuclear weapons systems be thereby enhanced. The serious impact of hoax reports of bombs on commercial aircraft brought about specific remedial legislation in 1961 (18 U.S.C. 35). The same necessity for deterrence, which led to the adoption of that legislation, is applicable here, and the imperatives are greatly magnified in view of the direct involvement of the security of our nuclear weapons system.

EDWARD J. MEEMAN, EDITOR OF THE MEMPHIS PRESS-SCIMITAR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, my district, the State of Tennessee, and our Nation have been enriched by the life and works of the extraordinary man, Edward J. Meeman, who died November 15 at his home, Forest Farm, in Shelby County, Tenn.

Mr. Meeman was the longtime editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar and at the time of his death was editor emeritus

of that newspaper and conservation editor for all of the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

He has left a rich legacy which we all may continue to enjoy—a legacy of example, of courage, and of accomplishment.

His example reaffirmed the American belief that industry and imagination and service bring rich rewards. A poor boy, he began newspapering to earn money for college tuition. But he never got to college. For in newspaper work he found satisfactions and challenges he could not abandon. He pursued them for a lifetime with all the considerable strength of his lively mind—and in the process acquired a breadth of knowledge and understanding that many an academician might envy. Combined with these qualities of mind, his industry and dedication to public service won for him not only a national reputation but considerable wealth.

His courage contributed largely to his success. He was a crusader. And he never took on easy adversaries or sought to realize trivial dreams. His foes were political machines that deprived the people of their right to self-determination. His friends were those who would stand with him and insist that the least privileged of citizens had a right to fair treatment and a respectful hearing. His dreams were big enough to encompass the welfare of the millions. A few among the dreams he helped realize were the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in east Tennessee, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Shelby Forest State Park in west Tennessee. And he worked persistently over the years for a Federal union of the Atlantic nations which he thought would best preserve for the many those individual liberties set out in our own Constitution.

His accomplishments, finally, were his greatest legacy. They stand as a challenge to those of his profession who would do as well as he. And they remain as a bequest to the generations. Apart from his professional accomplishments as the founding father of one Scripps-Howard newspaper—now the Knoxville News-Sentinel—and for three decades the guiding spirit of another—the Memphis Press-Scimitar—he labored long and successfully for a more beautiful city, State, and Nation, and for the brotherhood of the races of man who together would enjoy them. He was a leader in community race relations. He was an early champion of the Wilderness Act, passed by the last Congress. He was past chairman of the Conference on State Parks and a member of Interior Secretary Stewart Udall's advisory board on national parks. The National Wildlife Federation in 1965 honored him with its first Whooping Crane Award.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following editorial and memorial accounts of the life and career of Edward J. Meeman:

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar, Nov. 16, 1966]

EDWARD J. MEEMAN

Mankind is like a great cable stretching from the misty past to the misty future . . . all of us are strands twisted into this cable, some long, some short; some contributing strength, some weakness.

Ed Meeman was a long, strong strand in the cable of human life—77 years old when he died yesterday after 59 years with the Scripps-Howard Newspapers . . . 45 years in Tennessee, 31 years as editor of The Press-Scimitar until 1962, then four years in a new career as Scripps-Howard Conservation Editor.

Meeman had positive convictions and courage and persistence to support them.

He was quick to praise good service to the public, but was stern and impatient with ideas he considered bad, and with those who held such ideas.

Yet there was never any hatred in his heart for individuals.

He was deeply religious, with great faith in the power of prayer.

He was both thrifty and generous. He spent little on himself, saved and carefully invested his money so he could put it to uses dear to him. His philanthropies ranged from the $2 bills he passed out to Negro employes of Memphis Publishing Co. on Christmas Eves to $50,000 for the memorial fund for Senator Estes Kefauver, whom he had encouraged to seek the senatorship to help break the grip of machine politics on the state and work for closer association of the world's democracies. In between the figures mentioned, he made gifts and loans to many individuals and organizations.

Some years ago he established the Edward J. Meeman Foundation to assure that his money would continue to work after he was gone for the things he considered important.

His constant goals as a humanitarian newspaperman were three:

To print all the news of interest and importance to the public—carrying out The Press-Scimitar's motto: "Give Light and the People Will Find Their Own Way."

To stimulate the people to greater interest and activity in civic and governmental affairs on all levels from local to world . . . help them adopt worthy objectives, then help them achieve those objectives.

To awaken the people and their officials to the need for conserving and developing natural resources.

He was never satisfied with his notable successes toward these goals . . . he knew these are things that have to be won over and over.

Monuments to Ed Meeman and his work are many: the Great Smoky Mountains National Park . . . Shelby Forest . . . TVA and its dams and power-line towers . . . mental health facilities for which he sparked drives . . . hotly contested races and huge turnouts of voters showing intensified interest in public affairs. . . .

Many hearts in the community and over the nation feel a deep personal loss today. But their consolation is that Ed Meeman's work and the influence of his personality will be woven into the future by the life-strands which the strand of his own life touched.

Life goes on . . . the movements he helped will go on . . . The Press-Scimitar will go on, serving the people.

And that was Ed Meeman's consolation, too, when he realized that his activity was ended.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Nov. 16, 1966]

EDWARD J. MEEMAN

Edward J. Meeman, dead at 77, was guided by one great desire—to see the resources created by God used fully and well by mankind.

This, as we knew the longtime editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, was his credo.

Call him a reformer if you wish, and you'd be partly right. But his passion was not merely for change; rather it was for making men conscious of what they might put into life while they were taking from it.

How men govern themselves, how they preserve and conserve their country's heritages and lands, how they hold back the neon tidal wave of ugliness along highways, how they use their personal capacity for work—all these were Ed Meeman's interests.

His lifelong dedication to conservation reached from the Great Smokies of East Tennessee to Shelby Forest by the Mississippi River—the area where he chose to make his home. He will be remembered as an early advocate of the Tennessee Valley Authority—in the river taming time. In later years, he expanded his conservation concern to a national scale. But it was not to save a tree or a lump of soil that motivated him; what he wanted was for future generations of Americans to share and know the country of their ancestors, and to have left some broad horizons not eaten away by erosion and urbanization.

Government is always of vital interest to a good editor, and Ed Meeman came to Memphis 35 years ago with that goal at heart. Right or wrong, win or lose, he fought for what he believed best for the City of Memphis. His thinking was marked by independence and conviction, and his positions were pressed with persistence.

In an out-reaching spirit, he occupied himself with deep enthusiasm in such projects as Atlantic Union and Moral Rearmament—idealistic dreams, to be sure, but dreams which he believed to be aimed at the well-being of all people.

As a newspaper editor—one who was both a rival and a colleague—he had the acknowledged qualities of courage and fortitude—both physically and intellectually.

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel and other Scripps-Howard Newspapers, Nov. 16, 1966]

EDWARD J. MEEMAN

He was the "elder statesman" of Scripps-Howard, a man rich in years and personal accomplishment at the time of his death yesterday at age 77.

His titles during his late years included conservation editor of the Scripps-Howard Newspapers and editor emeritus of The Memphis Press-Scimitar. But they didn't begin to tell the inspiring, up-by-the-bootstraps story of Edward J. Meeman, scrapper, dreamer, founding father of one of Scripps-Howard's most successful papers.

His Scripps-Howard career began in 1907 when, as an 18-year-old high school graduate, he joined the staff of his hometown paper, The Evansville Press. By 1916 he was its managing editor.

In 1921 with a shirt-tail full of type and only two reporters he founded a Scripps-Howard paper, The Knoxville (Tenn.) News, in a city already served by two well established dailies.

Driving energy, vitality of mind and fearless presentation of and comment on the news characterized his career. And within four years those qualities made The Knoxville News the city's largest daily. The afternoon Sentinel was absorbed and Ed Meeman became editor of The Knoxville News-Sentinel. Throughout the Knoxville years he exposed corruption in city government, won his fight for a city manager plan, urged such locally unpopular moves as repeal of prohibition and the antievolution law, and helped create the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

When he became editor of The Memphis Press-Scimitar in 1931 he brought his enthusiasms with him. His tooth-and-toenail fight against Boss Crump's domination of the city and state won national attention. His good-government campaigns eventually broke boss rule and helped launch the late Sen. Estes Kefauver on his national career. Shelby Forest, a handsome state park, stands on the outskirts of Memphis as a monument to his imagination and enterprise.

A vocal champion of good local government, he nevertheless dreamed of—and campaigned for—a Federal Government that would embrace the entire Atlantic community. A practicing liberal, he was quick to condemn and expose shoddy causes that wrapped themselves in a "liberal" flag.

Ed Meeman was a bachelor who made newspapering his life and love. He was a rugged individualist and, even rarer, a practical idealist. But throughout his long career in a hard-boiled business he never lost his belief in people or his deep personal concern for their dignity and their rights. Nor did he ever lose his sense of excitement and wonder about the world and the events that made it turn.

He fitted the description of the ancient Chinese philosopher Mencius who described a great man as one "who does not lose his child's heart." For all his years and all his battles Edward J. Meeman never lost his "child's heart." And this, too, helped make him a great editor.

[From the Scripps-Howard News]

MEMPHIS.—"There was never a man quite like Edward J. Meeman," Null Adams, assistant managing editor of The Press-Scimitar, said at a memorial service for the late editor.

"He was many things to many people as most great men are.

"He was a human dynamo. He was a ball of fire. And his was a victorious life."

The memorial service for Mr. Meeman, editor emeritus of The Press-Scimitar and conservation editor of Scripps-Howard Newspapers, was held at First Unitarian Church, which overlooks the wide expanse of the Mississippi River as it turns past Memphis for New Orleans. The church was filled with friends, including most of the staff of his newspaper.

Mr. Meeman was cremated and his ashes were buried, in keeping with his instructions, on his beloved Forest Farm near Shelby Forest which he helped create. There was no usual funeral, thus the memorial service.

The Rev. James Madison Barr, pastor, presided and introduced Adams who had served 30 years as city editor—most of it under Meeman—before he was promoted to assistant managing editor by Charles H. Schneider, editor of The Press-Scimitar.

"Monuments to Edward J. Meeman are everywhere," Adams said.

"The Great Smokey Mountains National Park in East Tennessee which he fought for as editor of The Knoxville News-Sentinel.

"The great network of Tennessee Valley Authority hydro-electric power dams on the Tennessee River which provide flood control, navigation and cheap electricity for the rural homs and cities of Tennessee. These power plants made possible the Oak Ridge atomic plant. The great power plants were a by-product.

"But Edward J. Meeman's greatest love of the TVA, he said many times to me as we campaigned to establish TVA throughout the area, were the forests, lakes and recreation areas which were created by the building of the dams on the river.

He established Shelby Forest almost single handed. We used to survey these overflow-cut-over land areas on Sunday afternoons looking for a forest site. One Sunday afternoon his car was stuck in the mud. "What do we do now?" he asked. "Find a farmer with a team of mules to pull us out," I replied. We did and he was as happy as a child over the experience. All his life, he said, he had heard of being pulled out of a mudhole by a team and at last it had happened to him.

"The great city hospital complex grew out of the first John Gaston Hospital which he fought for as an editor.

"The expansive mental health program in Memphis, with two fine new mental hospitals, which came from his newspaper's campaign.

"Conservation projects across the nation came about after Edward J. Meeman grew nationally into conservation editor for Scripps-Howard Newspapers.

"But the greatest monument of all to Edward J. Meeman does not show in brick, mortar and steel, nor in the expansive recreation areas. Nor in the giant hydro-electric power plants.

"It's in the hearts and minds of his fellow citizens—in the hearts and minds of the entire community.

"It is freedom—freedom of speech and free elections—which is Democracy at its best. Under Edward J. Meeman's leadership, the Press-Scimitar sparked the movement that took the chains off citizenship in Memphis and Tennessee.

"His was a victorious life.

"He fought and defeated a state political machine.

"He fought and defeated a powerful county political machine.

"He exposed and broke up crooked elections.

"He brought about permanent registration of voters in the state as another stepping stone to honest elections.

"He secured voting machines for Shelby County to insure an honest count of the ballot.

"He got rid of back-alley voting places and now most elections are held in schools and churches.

"Perhaps the greatest of all his victories lies ahead—when Memphis changes its form of government in 1968.

"He lived to see the people approve Mayor-Council form of government. He had advocated City Manager form for 20 years. There are some City Manager procedures in the new Mayor-Council plan—thanks to Edward J. Meeman.

"He inspired those who worked for him to get more out of life—spurring them on to greater undertakings. As one of those, I quit trying to keep up with him. I just followed along. And I mean this literally. Did you ever try to go hiking over the hill of Shelby Forest Farm with him? If you did—you know what I mean.

"Edward J. Meeman's slogan was 'Citizens, working alone, can accomplish much. A newspaper, working alone, can accomplish much. Citizens and a newspaper, working together, can accomplish anything.'

"Nothing—for the good of his community and his newspaper—was ever impossible to Edward J. Meeman. His life shed light on the community, state and nation.

"His accomplishments will benefit generations to come.

"Edward J. Meeman left some big footprints on the sands of this community's life. And some examples and goals to challenge our imagination in the years to come."

[From the Scripps-Howard Newspapers]

MEMPHIS, TENN., November 16.—Tributes to the memory of Scripps-Howard's "elder statesman," Edward J. Meeman, poured in today from the First Family, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, Congressmen, colleagues and other friends he had made during a long and vigorous newspaper career.

Mr. Meeman, conservation editor of The Scripps-Howard Newspapers and editor emeritus of The Memphis Press-Scimitar, died at his home, Forest Farm, outside Memphis after suffering a heart attack yesterday. He was 77.

Said Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, with whom Mr. Meeman shared an enthusiasm for a more beautiful America: "The voice and pen of Mr. Meeman have been stilled. But his invaluable work over many years in conservation is a lasting legacy to all Americans. Through his efforts we shall all be richer in the beauty of our land."

Secretary Udall hailed Mr. Meeman's "yeoman work" as a member of the Interior Department's advisory board on national parks. Said Udall: "For many years he was the leading voice for conservation in the mid-continent area. Over the years his crusades for conservation resulted in landmark decisions which have affected the continent and enhanced the future of all citizens . . ."

Mr. Meeman died as his colleagues, editors of all of the Scripps-Howard Newspapers, were meeting in annual conference at Hollywood, Fla. They adopted this resolution:

"Ed Meeman was a man of firm convictions, indivisible integrity, and a warm heart. His 59 years in the newspaper business were devoted to service in his community, and toward the preservation and enhancement of the outdoors.

"Parks and wilderness have been dedicated to all future generations because of his imagination and constant efforts.

"His associates among the Scripps-Howard editors, who are meeting in Hollywood, will miss his lively eloquence, his sound point of view, and his gentle presence.

" 'Thirty' comes inevitably to every editor, and in the case of Ed Meeman it comes with a silent moment of gratitude for his many fruitful years."

Individually his colleagues offered these tributes:

Jack R. Howard, President and Editorial Manager of Scripps-Howard Newspapers: "When I think of Ed Meeman I think especially of two things, courage and tolerance for the other man's point of view. He had these qualities in abundance. And that is why he was a great editor for more than 40 years."

Walker Stone, Editor-in-Chief of Scripps-Howard Newspapers: "We who had the good fortune to work for years with Ed Meeman feel a great loss. He was a superb editor and a fine citizen."

Charles E. Scripps, Chairman of the Board of Scripps-Howard Newspapers: "No journalist ever dedicated himself more completely or more sincerely to his profession. In this way Ed Meeman served his country and the community in which he lived as few men have."

Frank Ahlgren, Editor of the Memphis Commercial-Appeal:

"Ed was a man of great courage—physically and intellectually. He was an honorable, dynamic member of his profession. Journalism has lost a distinguished member."

Loye W. Miller, Editor of the Knoxville News-Sentinel: "Ed Meeman was more than a great newspaperman. He was a great humanitarian. He never had a family himself, but he was a lifetime champion of the Family of Man."

Boyd Lewis, President and Editor of Newspaper Enterprise Ass'n.: "I never knew a more helpful man or a more able colleague than Ed Meeman. He was often my spur and conscience—and always appreciated."

Mark Ferree, Executive Vice President and General Business Manager of Scripps-Howard Newspapers: "I feel very heavily the loss of a highly esteemed friend and colleague in Ed Meeman's passing. He will be long-remembered for his integrity and purpose as a citizen and one of the country's most respected editors."

George Carmack, Editor of the Albuquerque Tribune: "Few men who ever lived could be called noble. In fact I can think of only one man I ever knew who could truly be called a noble man. This man was Ed Meeman. No man ever forgot himself and thought of others—or his city, his state and his nation—more than Ed Meeman.

The Tennessee Valley Authority's chairman, Aubrey J. Wagner, spoke for the TVA Board in saying:

"A generation produces only a handful of real giants in conservation. Ed Meeman was one of those for our time. Both his reasoned

judgment and his instinctive responses to issues concerning resource use and resource conservation invariably reflected his primary concern for the long-term public good.

"His deep interest and great confidence in TVA and its significance have been a continuing inspiration to all of us for a third of a century."

Sen. Albert Gore (D., Tenn.) hailed the longtime editor as "one of the finest, gentlest, most genuinely unselfish people I have ever known" and praised Meeman's "devotion to human betterment in all respects."

Sen. Ross Bass (D., Tenn.) said he was "honored to count Ed Meeman a friend. He was an outstanding journalist and editor and a progressive-minded community servant."

One of the nation's top conservationists, Thomas L. Kimball, executive director of the National Wildlife Federation, said that because of Meeman's conservationist zeal, "millions of Americans are enjoying a better life. Perhaps this, more than any other accomplishment in his long and productive life, is the true measure of his greatness."

A memorial service will be held at 3:30 p.m. tomorrow at the First Unitarian Church in Memphis. Mr. Meeman willed that his ashes be buried at Forest Farm "that they might return to the eternal uses of the earth."

THE WORK AND SERVICE OF THE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a summary of the report of the House Select Committee on Small Business during the 89th Congress.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during these early days of the 90th Congress, I would like to remind my colleagues—and especially those who have just been elected to serve their first term in the House of Representatives—that the House Small Business Committee and its staff stands ready at all times to serve all Members of the House who may desire help in handling the problems confronting their small business constituents.

It is recognized that small and independent businessmen face a wide variety of problems. The House Small Business Committee and its staff, over the years, by virtue of its experience and expertise, has established a distinguished record of successes and accomplishments in its work in behalf of American small business and in strengthening our free enterprise system. All Members of the House are invited to call upon the committee for assistance in any area of complaints and problems advanced by their small business constituents. I know that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, Congressman ARCH A. MOORE, JR., ranking minority member of the committee, joins with me in this statement.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to have reproduced and reprinted in the body of the RECORD a summary of the reports prepared by the committee during the preceding 89th Congress.

Most of the hearings and investigations conducted by the committee during the last Congress are summarized in nine different reports approved by the full committee and now on file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. The final report contains, among other things, a brief summary of these nine reports, which are listed below. Copies of all of these reports are available to Members of the House. Requests for needed copies should be made to the committee. The reports are:

Organization and Operation of the Small Business Administration—1966;

Small Business Investment Program of the Small Business Administration—1966;

Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Small Business—Report of the Subcommittee Chairman to the Subcommittee;

Small Business Subcontracting and Set-Aside Programs—Procurement;

The Role of Small Business in the Air Transportation Industry—Air Travel Agents and Air Freight Forwarders;

Small Business Problems in Urban Areas—small businesses displaced or injured by urban renewal and other federally financed construction projects;

Activities of Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies Relating to Small Business—Federal Communications Commission;

The Effect of Corn Marketing by the Commodity Credit Corporation upon Small Business;

Tool and Die Industry, and Associated Problems of Manufacturers and Distributors of Machine Tools; and

Final Report—A summary of the various investigations and hearings conducted by the committee during the 89th Congress.

REPORT ON THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

During the public hearings covering the Small Business Administration, all of the operations of the agency were reviewed by the full committee. Special emphasis was placed on three issues: First, the recent loan curtailments, policies, and funding of the agency; second, the small business lending program under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act; and third, the operations of small business investment companies under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended.

A field investigation into the operation of title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act was conducted in Detroit. The information thereby adduced together with the evidence developed during the course of the hearings indicated to some members of the committee that the small business lending program of the Office of Economic Opportunity should be transferred to the Small Business Administration. During the debate on this bill in September 1966, the chairman and other members of the committee supported an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, Representative DINGELL, to carry out this transfer, which amendment was adopted by the House.

Much criticism had been received concerning the investment program. The committee devoted a good portion of the hearing to this problem. As a result of these hearings and hearings by other committees pertaining to the small business investment program, legislation was enacted which will enable the Small Business Administration to supervise these companies more efficently and enhance the effectiveness of the program.

REPORT ON TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

The report of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, has brought to light many instances in which the tax-exempt privilege has been abused; instances in which unfair practices were applied in a manner prejudicial to small business and to other businesses not enjoying tax exemption.

The work of the subcommittee has been noted by the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service. Indeed, President Johnson recognizes the problem of foundation-controlled enterprises in competition with taxpaying businessmen, and has called upon the Congress "to deal with abuses of tax-exempt private foundation." See the President's Economic Report to Congress, January 27, 1966, page 18.

The report of the subcommittee chairman describes and summarizes the results of the investigations conducted by the subcommittee during the 89th Congress.

REPORT ON SUBCONTRACTING AND PROCUREMENT SET-ASIDE PROGRAMS

The subcommittee's hearings, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York, Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, were held in the wake of a change made by the then Administrator of the Small Business Administration, who transferred the responsibility for set-asides from SBA to the procurement agencies and eliminated SBA's procurement center representatives.

Additional testimony regarding the set-aside change was taken from SBA following the appointment of Bernard L. Boutin as the new Administrator. He requested an opportunity to study his predecessor's change in the set-aside program and to return to the committee with recommendations at the beginning of the 90th Congress. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget also testified that the change would be reconsidered and reported to the committee at the same time.

REPORT ON THE ROLE OF SMALL BUSINESS IN THE AIR TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY (TRAVEL AGENTS AND FREIGHT FORWARDERS)

The Distribution Subcommittee held hearings on the role of small business in the air transportation industry. These hearings were primarily concerned with the problems of small business travel agents, particularly with respect to the sale of air passenger transportation.

Seven hearings were held, including sessions in Los Angeles, Chicago, and Washington. Over 100 witnesses testified or filed statements.

At the opening session of the hearings, the vice president of the Air Traffic Conference informed the subcommittee of the air carriers' willingness to join with the travel agents in forming a joint committee to study ticketing costs. This project, which had long been sought by travel agents, has since become a reality and is well on the road to completion.

The carriers, shortly after the announcement of the hearings, also withdrew a new proposed schedule for commissions which had been vigorously opposed by the travel agents because it reduced by 40 percent the commissions they would receive on the largest single category of tickets. Another byproduct of the hearings has been the granting, on a regular basis, of reduced-rate air transportation to travel agents for their personal use so as to allow them to become familiar with tourist and vacation areas and facilities.

NEW PLYWOOD STANDARDS

During the 89th Congress, the Distribution Subcommittee learned that the new standards committee working with the Secretary of Commerce on the proposed new plywood standard was composed exclusively of members of the American Plywood Association. The gentleman from Illinois, Congressman KLUCZYNSKI, acting chairman of the subcommittee, wrote the Secretary of Commerce calling this to his attention and requested that representatives of the independent sector of the industry be appointed to the committee. Shortly after the letter was sent, the committee was enlarged to include independent representation.

REPORT ON SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN URBAN AREAS (SMALL BUSINESSES DISPLACED OR INJURED BY URBAN RENEWAL AND OTHER FEDERALLY FINANCED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS)

Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Urban Small Business Problems under the chairmanship of Representative JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI in Chicago, Rochester, New York, Atlanta, and Washington. Testimony was received from over 200 witnesses, the bulk of whom were small businessmen. The witnesses also included such notables as the mayors of New York, Chicago, Rochester, and Atlanta, and the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Hearings were held in small business shopping centers, small business retail outlets in areas scheduled to be demolished, and shopping plazas, as well as the more usual formal hearing rooms. A wealth of new information concerning the problems actually confronting the Nation's urban small businessmen was compiled. Roundtable discussions by members of the academic community, the planning profession, city managers, and consultants were also held, during which these problems were subjected to intense analysis and scrutiny.

As a result of the hearings, the new Administrator of the Small Business Administration issued directives to all field offices that they are to establish at once close liaison with the field offices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and those units of local government in charge of urban renewal. The purpose of this liaison will be to see that every small businessman who is displaced by urban renewal is personally informed of the programs available to him in conjunction with urban renewal.

The subcommittee has also received assurances from the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration that several programs which have been enacted by the Congress but have not been implemented by these agencies will, in the immediate future, be fully operative.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF REGULATORY AND ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS (FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION)

Throughout the 89th Congress, Representative JOHN D. DINGELL was chairman of the Subcommittee on Activities of Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies Relating to Small Business. During the first session of the Congress, testimony was developed by the subcommittee from representatives of the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, and appropriate divisions of the Department of Agriculture. A summary of this testimony will be found in the committee's final report, chapter XII.

During the second session of the Congress, hearings were held on the activities of the Federal Communications Commission relating to small business. Testimony was received from spokesmen for small business florists concerning the entry of Western Union into the direct sale of flowers in intercity markets. They were fearful this would deprive them of a large portion of their market because of Western Union's access to the contents of messages sent for congratulatory purposes and other factors. The Commission, subsequent to inquiry lodged by the subcommittee, has instructed Western Union to prohibit its employees from using the contents of messages for the purpose of soliciting orders for flowers.

Testimony was also received concerning the allegedly discriminatory rate structure of the television networks for advertising purposes. During testimony before the subcommittee, ABC and NBC announced the abandonment of their former rate structure and the issuance of a new rate card which eliminated the alleged discriminatory practices.

Testimony was also received from spokesmen for small businessmen desiring the designation of additional radio spectrum so that they might make fuller usage of land mobile radio. Subsequent to an inquiry lodged by the subcommittee with the Commission, field studies of the feasibility of assigning additional spectrum for this purpose, which had long been sought by land mobile users, were commenced.

Testimony was also received from the proprietor of a proposed common carrier microwave system and spokesmen for small businessmen shared time computer center regarding the necessity of additional facilities, at reasonable cost, for the transmission of data. Subsequent to the receipt of this testimony by the subcommittees, the Commission has ruled that microwave may now be used for common carrier purposes and that a number of smaller firms may share the same facilities.

Testimony was also received from the telephone answering industry, independent producers of television programs, independent marketers of telephone equipment, radio and television station representatives, the National Association of Broadcasters, the community antenna television industry, and other small business communication interests.

REPORT ON THE EFFECT OF CORN MARKETING BY THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION UPON SMALL BUSINESS

During June 1966 the Subcommittee on Special Investigations of Small Business Problems, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Iowa, Representative NEAL SMITH, conducted 5 days of hearings concerning the effect of corn marketing by the Commodity Credit Corporation upon small business.

The subcommittee had received numerous complaints concerning price discrimination and other marketing factors which alleged that country elevators and other small businessmen had not been allowed to participate equitably in the purchase of Commodity Credit Corporation corn. The complaints dealt specifically with an extremely heavy sale of corn by CCC during the first several months of the 1965 corn marketing year which began on October 1, 1965.

Following a rather comprehensive field investigation, public hearings were held at which testimony was received from cooperative associations and independently owned elevator and warehouse operators from the Iowa and Minnesota grain marketing areas. Witnesses from the Department of Agriculture also testified.

Based upon the subcommittee investigations and hearings, the committee adopted a report, House Report No. 2082, which contains the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the subcommittee.

Subsequent to the adoption of the above report, owners of country elevators and independent warehousemen have reported that they are well pleased with developments that have taken place as a result of the subcommittee's hearings. They have commended the subcommittee and expressed their deep appreciation for the subcommittee's help.

REPORT ON SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN THE TOOL, DIE, AND MACHINE TOOL INDUSTRIES

The Subcommittee on Special Investigations of Small Business Problems, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Iowa, Representative NEAL SMITH, also conducted hearings on July 26 and 27, 1966, concerning problems of the tool and die industry and associated problems of manufacturers and distributors of machine tools.

For some time the committee had received information from these industries that they were faced with important problems involving the inability to expand and modernize because of a lack of capital and the inability to meet production requirements because of a lack of skilled manpower. This matter was referred to the Subcommittee on Special Investigations of Small Business Problems and hearings were conducted.

At these hearings representatives of tool and die manufacturers, machine tool producers, and machine tool distributors appeared before the subcommittee. Testimony was also received from officials of the Small Business Administration, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Labor. Special emphasis was placed on the tool, die, and

precision machine industries because all of the problems affecting these industries specifically affected the tool and die manufacturers. This entire industry is comprised of small businessmen.

THE COMMITTEE'S RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

Mr. Speaker, over the years the House Small Business Committee, time and again, has proven its usefulness to the Members of Congress and to the small business community.

The committee has established a long and distinguished record of service and accomplishment. During the 90th Congress, the committee once again will endeavor conscientiously to maintain this tradition.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. HAROLD LEVANDER OF MINNESOTA

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include the inaugural address of the new Governor of Minnesota.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1967, Gov. Harold LeVander gave his inaugural address to the 65th session of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota.

In this forward-looking address Governor LeVander called for "a new generation of problem solvers, a new breed of men and women." Mr. Speaker, this document is consistent with the campaign statements of Mr. LeVander. It encompasses the 1966 Minnesota Republican State platform, one of the finest State party platforms ever drafted in this Nation. It outlines a solid program to make Minnesota a leader in the community of States.

I am proud to insert Governor LeVander's address in the RECORD:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislature, the Judiciary, Constitutional Officers, and Citizens of Minnesota.

I come before you today with a great sense of humility and an unashamed pride—humility in the awareness of the trust you have placed in me and the responsibilities I have been asked to bear. And pride in having the opportunity of giving four years of service to the great State of Minnesota.

As we come here today called by this historic ceremony—a ceremony that has been repeated for 32 Governors in this State, I can't help but consider how they must have regarded their new position. I wish I had some mystic powers to find out.

But I do know and frankly want you to know that being Governor means to me.

I approach being Governor hoping to serve the people as a leader in problem-solving.

There is a strong tradition of problem-solvers in Minnesota. Sweep through the pages of our history.

The frontier had to be settled.
Forest pushed back.
Homes built.
Schools erected, churches constructed.
Turn more pages and you see
Mines being scooped.
Trains being tracked.
Highways being laced.
More recently we've seen
Airports dotted across our land and special institutions built by the State.

These were the tasks for the previous problem-solvers. They were clear cut, tangible, easy to grasp.

They needed to move—so they paved roads.

They needed to farm—so they cleared the land.

They needed to learn—so they built schools.

Their's was an age of activity . . . ours a decade of decision.

In deliberation is wisdom . . . in decision is a bold new stroke of progress; progress tempered by the years of painful adolescence and restless penetration into an unknown future.

Let us now employ the fruits of our labors.

Let us embark today—in 1967—upon the decade of decision.

Our decade of decision can be an era of resolve unsurpassed in Minnesota history. It can be a period of unprecedented growth, of unrivaled acclaim.

It can produce the day of reckoning for our social ills. It can light the path to equal opportunity.

The groundwork has now been laid, the foundation entrenched. Our North Star State is standing on the brink of maturity.

The next steps must be firm, bold, decisive.

We must produce a decade of decision.

In order to solve their difficulties, our fathers mobilized money and manpower. Granted, this is perhaps an over-simplified analysis, yet in reality these two resources were constantly used as answers to the pressing issues. And with confidence, impatience and optimism, they solved their problems. Even the early folklore of these people reflects an expectation of quick, easy answers that only demanded organizing our resources. Remember the tales of Paul Bunyan. When Babe the Blue Ox needed a new pair of shoes the blacksmith had to open a new iron mine—to give Babe drinking water, Paul scooped out the Great Lakes.

As Americans we are still living out the folklore. We issue an alliance for progress in South America and expect immediately political and social calm. We are frustrated by a war in Viet Nam which may not be concluded in the near future. Clearly the temper of our history is haste.

May I here interrupt just long enough to officially extend to our fine Minnesota men serving our nation in Viet Nam the congratulations and well wishes of their new Governor.

But now that we in haste constructed the artifacts of civilization, what do we really have.

We have strung poles from coast to coast, vastly improved the techniques of communication, but have we given equal attention to what we want to communicate?

Now that we have hurled highways across the State, must we witness a continual funeral procession travel those highways?

Now that we have built correctional institutions, are we more interested in the institutions and less concerned with the correction?

We have built the schools and laid a foundation for education, but have we only transmitted information and not instilled wisdom? A Chicago professor interested in the humanizing effect of education said you are educated only if you can answer "yes" to these questions:

Do you sympathize with all good causes?

Are you public spirited?

Are you a brother to the weak?

Will a lonely dog follow you down the street?

We have sprouted high-rise apartments for our senior citizens' well-being, but have we nurtured concern for their real happiness or peace of mind? Have we kept for them Robert Browning's attitude toward old age, "It's the last of life for which the first was made."

Now I don't mean to say we aren't going to have to continue to build roads, schools, hospitals and sewage plants. But rather, I want to suggest that there is a shift in the nature of the problems we face. There is a change in emphasis. No longer are the urgent issues the mere collection of physical resources—clearing, building, paving; but the application of mental capacities—wisdom, understanding, motivation and concern. Basically problems solved through the application of the mind and the invocation of the heart. The problems of maturity are not the same as those of adolescence. Nor are the problems of 3½ million people living in the same area formerly occupied by a few thousand pioneers the same.

That's why this State calls for a new generation of problem-solvers, a new breed of men and women.

And these people must have special attributes.

They must have keen minds and a sense of judgment. Never before have so many of our problems been approached by so many avenues. On almost every question before us today there are studies, surveys, reports, lists and hypotheses. We need people who have critical and analytical minds.

We need people who have an understanding and compassion for men. We need people who want to follow the commandment "Love one Another".

Because our most critical problems are really people problems, we are going to have to try to understand people. How do we encourage society to accept the former convict? How do we motivate underprivileged children? How do we create true harmony among races? How do we assure our senior citizens of a meaningful life? These concerns touch the individual personality. It's our own responsibility to dream the dreams that will ease the hurts of mankind.

Our new problem-solvers must also be people willing to cooperate. The problems of a mature Minnesota stretch beyond our towns, counties and districts—they are problems of all of us. Education, human rights, mental health, conservation, metropolitan sprawl, recreation—these aren't problems of Montevideo, Montgomery or Monticello. These burdens lie before Minnesota.

It's going to take all of us working together for the higher goal—the greater good. Don't misunderstand me. I'm not asking you to deny your community loyalty. My dedication to South St. Paul is well known. But I am asking you to answer the call and meet the challenges of Minnesota.

And thirdly, our new problem-solvers will need patience, perserverance. These problems will not disappear within 1967, or my administration or the 20th Century. But we must begin today. There is no clear-cut single answer to all of these problems. Their causes are complex and illusive. Those of us working to try to solve them will be frustrated and wearied. But as a people we should pray not so much for our problems to disappear as for the resolution to grapple with them. For as we shed the endearing garments of childhood and adolescence and take upon ourselves the heavy mantle of a mature people, we must develop the inner and outer demeanor requisite of that statute, for greatness is measured not in pomp and circumstance, but in the steadfast determination and total commitment to bearing mighty burdens.

And there is a hope of greatness in Minnesota's destiny; if her new problem solvers will grant her her full potential as a State. For too long we have been comforted by slogans rather than striving for solutions, cautious instead of creative, become timid in the face of an alert and aggressive federal government. A Federal Government called upon by the people to fill the vacuum of the State's inactivity.

Surely we have waited as long as we dare to reassume the direction of our State's destiny. And while we must enter a new era of decisive activity here, we must also be pre-

pared to push our abilities to the limit in the interest of cooperation with the Federal Government.

We must be alert enough to lead; yet wise enough to follow.

We must be bold enough to innovate; humble enough to learn from others.

This decade will determine if the states are sincere about their responsibilities not only their rights.

The responsibilities that lie before us are varied, and no one knows better than you, the Legislators of this State, the urgency of resolving our problems.

But the opportunities that beckon also are vast. For an interested and inspired State can chart new programs. Programs that could be models for other states and examples for federal action.

I am asking Minnesota to take the opportunity to initiate and implement programs that will set the pace for meeting our present and future problems. In a word, I am asking Minnesota to lead.

If we in Minnesota can't create racial harmony, we should ask no state to do it.

If we in Minnesota can't handle our Metropolitan problems, we should expect no state to do it.

If we in Minnesota can't develop our natural and human resources, we should challenge no state to do it.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIP

But for us in Minnesota to assume our responsibilities and assure problem solving, we must have a strong financial foundation. Because the Federal Government has preempted the best sources of revenue from the states, I suggest we consider a system of federal-state tax sharing. At a Governors' conference last month, I proposed that 5% of the personal income tax money collected by the Federal Government be kept in each state. This procedure would not tamper with existing federal programs to the states, merely give the states an additional source of funds to finance its program for its people.

The states also need a redefinition of their role in the area of federal financed programs. We have learned from recent experience that centralized administration from Washington in its inability to adapt to local variations often defeats the very purpose of the program. In the light of this knowledge, there must be developed in the next decade a new relationship where the states assume the major responsibility for the administration and adaptation of the programs with federal financial assistance.

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT RELATIONSHIP

But Minnesota must define its role with the local communities as well as with the Federal Government. It should be a vigorous agency to counsel the local community, coordinate intra-community efforts and provide financial assistance when needed.

For example, the need for business development is acknowledged, but bringing it about needs a new creative, confident and cooperative thrust.

We have witnessed what a Taconite Amendment could do for the Range.

We must be willing to take similarly positive action to encourage the copper and nickel industry which may have potentials as great or greater than taconite.

But business development can be made to flourish in other parts of the outstate which have been suffering economic decline as well.

By enlisting the active support of organized labor, together with the maximum use of our talent in our colleges and universities and the cooperation of private industry and their research departments and councils, with better financial and promotional support from a reorganized and revitalized Business Development Department matching funds with local organizations, we can attract new business and expand existing business. The job opportunities thus created can perhaps stem the costly brain drain from our state that we are presently experiencing.

The call for new problem solvers is nowhere more apparent than in the relation of local communities to each other in problems that transcend geographical boundaries. I refer to the unique difficulties occasioned by our metropolitan sprawl.

You need only to have your patience tried in the nightly bumper-to-bumper lineup of cars and buses on a hundred roads in the Twin City area to realize the demand for such an intercommunity or area-wide service effort. This congestion merely mirrors the complex problems oozing out of our massive urban growth. While the transit problem is most apparent, other concerns are equally demanding. So urgent is the need for this state to act, I'm going to outline a proposal today to enable the people of the metropolitan area to be adequately served by an instituted agency. I won't pretend to expect that this proposal shall be adopted chapter and verse. Modifications shall be made. But I do expect this administration to begin, to begin today, to build its reputation as an administration and a Legislature willing to accept the challenge of change in this decade of decision.

With that understanding then, I recommend for your consideration an area-wide services council to provide important services for the seven-county Twin Cities area. This council could coordinate the functions of the present single purpose districts and would be given operating authority over most or all of these services:

1. Sewage disposal
2. Planning parks and open space
3. Transit system
4. Air and water pollution
5. Maintaining a central data center
6. Planning
7. Approval of Federal aid applications from local communities.

Federal funds are available to local communities only if they can demonstrate their project is part of an overall master plan.

After the creation of the Metropolitan Services Council, it would receive the transfer of the functions now held by the Metropolitan Planning Commission. This move is in line with a recommendation by that body.

The method of selecting representatives to serve on the council is a debatable point. We have had much debate, now let's decide. Any representation plan should fulfill the principle of preserving a high degree of responsibility to the communities being served, while functioning under authority of the Legislature.

The council should be made up of one member for each Senatorial District, giving us 31 members elected for two-year terms on a staggered basis. Selection of members on the council could be provided by either direct election within each senatorial district or appointment by the three legislators from each district.

The method of financing the functions of the Metropolitan Area Services Council would be a combination of state resources and resources from services offered. The taxing powers of the Metropolitan Council would be reserved for a two-year period, if then taxing power were to be granted the taxes must be based on a non-property resource.

We have related the question of coordinating planning to the metropolitan area. In the immediate future, however, and even today, growing urban areas throughout the state, such as Duluth, Rochester, Mankato, St. Cloud, are experiencing similar problems and needs.

Under the statute that I hope will come out of this session of this Legislature, these communities as well as the Twin City area will be authorized to establish area services councils.

To tie these councils together and to share common services and resources, a level of state coordination and information into the Governor's office is desirable which can be accomplished by an Office of Urban Affairs. I feel that instead of creating an independent office, the State Planning Agency should be enlarged by adding this office to its present responsibilities.

In order to efficiently and effectively be able to meet the growing state-wide demand for area services councils, we must realize that modification of the Unanimous Consent Law is necessary. I ask you to take such action.

If the state takes this initiative to be of service to local communities by the establishment of area-wide services councils, I think we can meet the challenge of change.

The state must also define its position to local communities and to its people in regard to taxation. In three weeks I shall detail specifically my budget message which shall include not only recommendations as to departmental finances, but provisions for tax reform. But a sketch of a few basic suggestions I would like to offer now.

We must do something immediately about the tremendous property tax burden our people are forced to carry. We can do this—and I ask most sincerely that you do.

First, property tax relief must be given to our senior citizens. A sliding scale should be devised, patterned after the Wisconsin plan which provides an income tax credit against property taxes so those elderly citizens with lesser incomes receive greater property tax reductions.

Secondly, we can relieve pressure on local property taxes if we increase our state aids to local school districts.

Thirdly, we can ease the strain on property taxes by beginning to shift a portion of the teachers' retirement from the property tax fund to income tax resources.

Fourthly, the states should return some additional revenue to local cities, villages and counties.

These are just four of the several proposals that will come out of my budget message. In considering the philosophy of taxation, we should not forget the mechanical and technical facets. We could improve our tax system if attention were given to these steps:

First, to reduce the classifications

Secondly, improve assessment procedures

Thirdly, fix full and true value at one-third of the market value

Fourthly, simplify property tax statements.

Our payment of taxes is to enable the state to render competent services to its citizens. We have a right to expect it. We have a duty to provide it. The plain truth, however, is that we are daily losing competent, trained personnel because our salary scale has fallen so far behind private industry, county and municipal government, other states' educational or government service.

The state can no longer be run as a second-rate industry. Minnesota has now arrived at a point where it will biennially spend more than one billion dollars. It has more than 19,000 employees and distributes its services to three and one-half million citizens. It is patently ridiculous or naive to believe that the largest industry operating exclusively in Minnesota, our state government, can exist with a staff whose salaries are not competitive, plus being invaded by inflation, with a Legislature without adequate staff assistants and an executive or managerial branch with an organizational structure built by accident not direction.

Force these handicaps on private industry and it could not survive. We must not permit a similar fate for our state government. To run our government on a competitive business principle, I recommend three necessary improvements.

First, I recommend we give our Legislature competent, professional staffing for its leadership, both Majority and Minority, and for

its interim commissions and committees. More than 800 bills are ready for introduction before the session begins. 1500 will probably be introduced before it closes. To expect each of you to become acquainted with this massive and detailed legislation without assistance is preposterous. While our University is about to begin the first phase of research on a new national experimental city project, it is paradoxical to expect our Legislature to work with frontier town equipment.

Secondly, I recommend a salary increase to our state employees in all classifications, including the faculties of our colleges and the University. A great deal of study has gone into a new civil service pay plan. I recommend you adopt it with these important modifications:

1. Eliminate the 16th range,

2. Approve the increases proposed in the first 12 ranges and by proportionately adjusting the proposed increases in the 13th, 14th, and 15th ranges so as to provide that the maximum at the end of the 15th range shall be $19,800.00.

I recognize that this will still leave us far below the maximum pay in the classified service in several states. To illustrate, the salary maximum of classified service of some other jurisdictions are as follows:

U.S. Federal Government	$25,890
New York	27,714
Michigan	34,410
Wisconsin	25,235
Georgia	33,348
Illinois	26,580
Indiana	38,580

From the above listing, it is obvious we will still be far below other states, but it is equally obvious that we must make at least this significant step forward. Future Legislators can make further adjustments in the top three ranges.

Above the classified service, I recommend you make the appropriate increases in a new department head salary bill. Salary increases for college and university personnel will be provided in the budget recommendations for these institutions.

3. A mandatory retirement at age 70.

4. In the first five steps, the increases will be automatic. In the last five steps, increases shall be based on merit with not more than 50% in any one step eligible for a merit increase.

I further recommend the correction of an inadvertent omission on the part of the last Legislature affecting the unclassified personnel, the faculties of the University, state colleges and junior colleges, and the university civil service personnel who were deprived of the insurance, medical and hospital benefits granted to the classified service. I recommend this be done early in the session so that it can become effective April 1st.

Thirdly, let us consider that for 25 years we have not had a comprehensive reorganization of state government. Bureaus, commissions and departments have been proliferated. We have two pre-audits and no post audit. The whole accounting and budget procedure needs drastic overhauling and adaptation for computerization. If we are to make state government effective in the modern age, there is an urgent need for streamlining and improvement in all three branches of government. I shall appoint a high level blue ribbon commission to make a thorough-going study and report of total government reorganization and modernization plus expenditure control in sufficient time before the next session of the Legislature so that its recommendations can be amply studied. Guidelines for the areas to be examined will be found in the Appendix attached to this Address.

Another group of Minnesotans deserve our consideration for a treasured right which they are yet denied. In this age of advancement and accelerated education, it behooves us to fully utilize the talents and perceptiveness of our 18 to 21 year-old citizens by extending to them the right to vote.

I believe that our youth in this age category have overwhelmingly demonstrated that they deserve this responsibility.

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE RELATIONSHIPS

A strong State Government having found its relationship with the Federal Government and the Local Government, anxious for its new responsibilities and qualified to accept them can answer what Adlai Stevenson termed "The call to greatness". Minnesota can and will in the next decade be a new problem solver, and we, selected to serve our people can restore the positive reference to government, because politics is truly the art of human happiness.

Never before has that definition cried for fulfillment as in this generation. For this generation is called upon to strive for human happiness in solving the people's problems. In the forefront of the category of people problems is the complex of issues classified as human relations. We have made progress in this field—brilliant progress compared to some states. But let not that remark be reassuring. For we have proclaimed our share of platitudes, and we have made our share of hurried, self-comforting gestures of interest. And we all know that won't suffice. It's high time that Minnesota State Government assumed its full responsibilities and the people of Minnesota—all the people of Minnesota—assume their complete responsibility. Let us who have been elected to serve the State through government assure our people we will take the following measures:

To create a State Department of Human Relations with an interest in the whole area of human relations, not merely an anti-discrimination agency. By incorporating S.C.A.D., the Human Rights Commission, the Status of Women Commission, and the Indian Affairs Commission we would have strengthened each individual commission and created one centralized effective and efficient agency.

However, it is futile to combine government commissions without assuring adequate staffing and funds. I frankly intend this Department should be created not for display but for decision. And my concern for this Department will be reflected in my budget message.

Other measures should be taken. We must guarantee that every man is secure in his constitutional right to the opportunity to purchase property commensurate with his ability to pay and his personal character. That constitutional guarantee directs us to consider and enact an enlarged fair housing law. The passage of the State Fair Housing Law covering the sale of publicly financed housing by the 1961 Legislature has been widely accepted and well received. I urge the 1967 Legislature to build on that foundation—now 6 years old—by including the sale of privately financed housing.

These are moves that can be made by government. But as Massachusetts Senator-elect Edward Brooke said in his recent book, "The solution is not easy. It will require much more than passing and enforcing laws dealing with the surface aspects of equality of opportunity. It will require working with the human stuff which is the real measurement of equality."

Brooke is right. In the final analysis, we must work with the human stuff—that is critical. Each individual must assume his personal obligation. But the State can set an example. I would like to lend the weight of the Governor's office to encouraging such attempts to train and motivate people as the Twin Cities Industrialization Opportunities Center and the complete family services rendered by settlement houses. It is my intention that the State Department of Human Relations would have grants available to these groups to assist them in their projects as well as such projects as therapeutic communities to allay anti-social behavior.

Because the possession of marketable skills is so vital to the development of self-reliance and self-respect, we must make sure that the state and federal scholarships to Indians are strengthened to meet Indian needs. In addition, these scholarships should be flexible enough to allow opportunity to receive training, skills or professional education.

We should also encourage the economic emancipation of our Indians as well as the advancement of their civil and human rights. Tangible steps can be taken through the protection of their traditional prerogatives in the wild rice industry and through the cooperation of public and private lending agencies to advance industrial development in Indian communities.

These are some beginning steps toward improving conditions and relations among Minnesotans. As I said earlier, if we in Minnesota can't create harmony among races, we should ask no state to do it. And let us be reminded that we shall be judged by the reality, not the rhetoric of human equality.

Bold new steps also are needed in the field of crime and corrections. The increase in crime in Minnesota is most discouraging. Last October, 13 percent more crimes had been committed than the same month a year ago. We must have a thorough comprehensive attack on lawlessness. A government by law must encourage respect for law.

A new and imaginative program has been instituted by Governor Love of Colorado. He appointed a statewide respect for law committee which, in turn, recommended a similar committee for every community in the state. On this committee, the clergy, the social worker, the school counselor, law enforcement officers, psychiatrists and service organizations were structured into an active group that surveyed the status of respect for law in the community and recommended those steps which would stimulate the correct understanding and attitude of children as well as adults.

Lack of parental authority, broken homes, excessive drinking, truancy, contempt for police, and several other factors were found to be matters that generated disrespect for law and on which proper community action and attention could improve. I will appoint a similar statewide committee in the hope that it, in turn, would recommend similar groups for each of our Minnesota cities.

A second front of attack must deal with those people who do not respect the law. Certainly our whole area of correctional institutions needs reexamination. For every three men we send to a correctional institution, two repeat their criminal activity. Sentenced to repeat their criminal activity because they have no reorientation, no skills to offer, and no offers for their skills.

So that our offenders will have marketable skills for gainful employment instead of being forced to resort to former avenues of support, I propose four actions:

1. That we expand the vocational training program for boys and adults, and we really initiate a vocational training program for girls.

2. That, under careful administration, we extend the work release program.

3. That a corrections vocational advisory committee be appointed, made up of men from business, labor and personnel from the institution. The function of this committee is to coordinate a training program consistent with the type of skills demanded, to work to eliminate private industries' hostility to the production of products in the institution which provide training for the men of the institution and to inform offenders nearing their release about job opportunities.

4. That attention should be focused on expanding the foster group home concept for juvenile offenders and the establishment of graded institutions for young offenders.

In addition to these efforts, study should be made of a potential influence and use of the correctional officer or guard in the reorientation process.

Lastly, we should reevaluate our parole system while making moves towards reducing the case load and paper work of the parole agent, allowing him more time for his people.

It's about time we did some serious thinking on our philosophy of correction. With the increasing incidence of crime, we need to concentrate our concern on prevention, correction and law enforcement. Therefore, let me focus your attention for a moment on some proposals to perfect our enforcement of the law. In addition to recruiting more agents of the law, we should attempt to make our present manpower more productive. Because police science is so complex, requiring knowledge—not only of techniques of prevention and apprehension—but also the application of complex Supreme Court decisions, we should require a statewide mandatory training program for all law enforcement officers. I wish to compliment the number of law personnel who have voluntarily attended such schools, and I want to provide everyone with the advantage of such training.

Last year only 21 to 24% of the crimes committed were solved. Police training must be coupled with police technology. We must not cripple our police force by restricting them from taking fullest advantage of technological progress. Therefore, I recommend the State Bureau of Criminal Apprehension make use of the computer system already available from the State. A centralized computer storing information accessible to each community's police force throughout the State would greatly facilitate our criminal apprehension effectiveness.

But certainly it is a foreboding forecast if only lawmen will make us men of the law. The law must be enforced but more importantly, respected.

Perhaps these respect for law committees and modernized police forces can begin to instill an attitude even in our drivers that will eventually reduce the daily crimes committed on our highways. But after a death toll last year of 964, we cannot depend upon that time-consuming process alone.

One of the major thrusts of this administration shall be a traffic safety program to stop the senseless slaughter. I ask you to consider these measures for that aim:

1. Adopt provision of uniform vehicle code, both as to chemical test standards and implied consent, for drunk driving.
2. Test for vision and knowledge of traffic laws each time a driver obtains or renews a license. Many Minnesota drivers are legally blind in other states.
3. Abolish the special motorbike license for 15-year olds.
4. Require cyclists and their passengers to wear safety equipment such as helmets and waistguards.
5. Increase fines and penalties for serious traffic violations.
6. Establish a state supervised by privately owned, effective, compulsory, periodic vehicle inspection program.
7. Increased attention should be given to a program of correcting high-accident locations such as roadside obstructions and hazardous curves. For example, many roads I traveled during the past political campaign with hazardous passing areas are not marked at all. This is a simple and inexpensive safety measure that could save untold accidents.

As an attorney, you can perhaps understand my concern for the mood in Minnesota and across the nation, a blatant disregard and disrespect for law. I ask your help in rebuilding the importance of honoring the law in the minds of Minnesotans.

Unfortunately, it is manifestly impossible for me to discuss with you all the proposals of my program within the confines of this formal occasion. None of us could absorb in one sitting the importance and intricacies of any Governor's complete program which deals with as diverse and complex topics as mental health, judicial reform, fine arts development, insurance and consumer protection, and will cover several dozen specific recommendations. I hope what I have said today gives you an idea of my dedication to solving old problems, my philosophy toward the approach to solving new problems, and my concept of the type of state government needed to serve the mid-twentieth century.

Understanding the attitude expressed in this Inaugural, I hope you will carefully survey and study these proposals appended hereto. Again, it is not intended to be a closed copy. New problems may arise during my administration which I will not have foreseen at this early date. Changing circumstances may call for readjustments. But I want you to know the direction your Governor is suggesting. These suggestions, of course, shall be amplified and detailed throughout my administration by a budget message, special messages, and conferences.

The challenge to me, as your Governor, is to mobilize and activate our human resources, both public and private human resources for the common good.

I have an unwavering confidence in the ability of both segments to act for the common weal of this commonwealth.

Minnesota can be proud of its Legislature. As I have traveled over the entire State this past year, I have had occasion to personally meet almost every member of the Legislature. I have learned of their standing in their home community. I have been tremendously impressed by the competence and dedication of the members of this body. That's why our citizens expect great things. I'm sure they will receive it at your hands.

And as years pass and public needs become vaster and more complex, the private concern and capacity to meet those needs become infinitely greater.

But whether you serve as a public servant or a private citizen, there is an assignment for each one of us, regardless of skills, financial standing or station. You *can* take part in the building of a better Minnesota. You *must* take part. I am *confident* you will take part.

For we must remember that our success will be determined by works—not words. Let us be reminded that greatness is not measured in pomp and circumstance—but in a steadfast determination and total commitment to bearing mighty burdens.

We will then be justified in re-echoing a paraphrase of Lincoln's statement, now a hundred years old, "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it will never forget what today we begin here."

THE TRUTH IN TRADING STAMPS ACT

Mr. WOLFF. 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. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon my colleagues to join with me in the introduction of legislation which heeds the cry of American homemakers who have agitated for a reduction in food prices. At the same time this bill I am introducing today will increase the U.S. Treasury coffers. This bill is titled "The Truth in Trading Stamps Act."

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that already the honorable gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] has joined with me in support of my bill.

Trading stamps add 2 percent to the cost of our food bill. If you could redeem your stamps for cash then the families of this Nation could save the cost of 1 week's supply of food. If we, the Congress, fail to act now, if we do not adhere to the cry of America's women, we are forcing them to pay for an additional week's supply of food.

This bill also will increase the U.S. Treasury coffers. Stamp companies today have the privilege of determining for the Treasury stamp redemption estimates. There is a serious question that no taxes have been paid on one half billion dollars of the stamp companies "hidden income" in unredeemed stamps over the past decade.

AMERICAN PEOPLE TAKING AN ACTIVE INTEREST IN THE AFFAIRS OF THEIR COUNTRY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it appears the American people are becoming increasingly aware of the activities of Congress and matters pending before this body typical of much correspondence I am currently receiving from my constituents is the following telegram:

> Object to increase in income tax. Agree with spending for South Vietnam conflict. Object to "Great Society" spending tending toward socialistic state and teachings of Marx and Engels. Object to reduction in highway program without equal or larger reduction in "Great Society" programs. Taxpayers request this be read and made a part of Congressional Record. Please furnish copy.
>
> Regards.
>
> E. J. NORTON.
>
> JENNINGS, LA.

I am pleased that so many of my constituents are taking an active interest in the affairs of our country. Candid expression of public opinion makes it easier for us here in Washington to represent the wishes and thinking of our constituents.

TRUTH IN TRADING STAMPS

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the last session of Congress, I introduced, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] and several others the Truth in Trading Stamps Act which I am today reintroducing.

We are not attacking or asking for the abolition of trading stamps. All we are asking for is an objective public body which will assist in the protection of the American consumer through insuring that the true facts are known about trad-

ing stamps, their value, their financing, and their methods of operation.

There are many lobbyists, high-paid lobbyists, for these trading stamp companies. We in Congress must be the lobbyists for the consumers, the housewives and the American people. We must determine the extent to which trading stamps are raising food prices.

And I say too, Mr. Speaker, you ought to talk with any small service station operator. He is threatened and coerced if he does not buy and use trading stamps. The big oil companies tell these little businessmen that they either use trading stamps or their rent will skyrocket, or their franchise to operate will be taken away.

It is high time we take aggressive steps to protect the American consumer by insisting on truth in trading stamps.

BRAVERY OF SGT. MAHLON BUCKALEW

Mr. ROBERTS. 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. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 10, 1967, the Tyler Courier-Times in Tyler, Tex., carried a story concerning a most daring and outstanding feat of bravery.

This story is about one of our fighting men in Vietnam, S. Sgt. Mahlon Buckalew, of Tyler, Tex.

Sergeant Buckalew's spirit, his bravery, his disregard for his own safety, earned him the Silver Star.

Such actions earn for him, also, the esteem and appreciation of all freedom loving, patriotic Americans.

I am indeed proud to join in extending to Sergeant Buckalew, and, indeed, all our men in uniform, my personal unwavering appreciation for holding the line against Communist aggression—for risking their lives that America might forever be free.

The full text of the story follows:

HOW TYLERITE WON SILVER STAR TOLD

A Texan at war scrambled outside of his out-of-control helicopter and, from its landing skids, shot back at the Communists on the ground who'd disabled it.

For the daring feat above the Vietnam jungles, S/Sgt. Mahlon Buckalew of Tyler was awarded the Silver Star.

Although he was never wounded, his ship was hit by Viet Cong on several of its missions supporting ground forces. He was a gunner platoon sergeant and served as a machine gunner for one of his company's choppers.

He reacted quickly when a Viet Cong soldier suddenly opened fire on the helicopter. The enemy gunner was too close, and at too sharp an angle, to be taken under fire from the aircraft.

Buckalew's citation reads in part: "With complete disregard for his safety, Sgt. Buckalew took a position on the aircraft's skids where he could return the hostile fire."

An enemy machine gun also opened fire, and Buckalew alternated his fire between the two threats, even after the helicopter's hydraulic system had been damaged and the craft had gone into an uncontrolled left roll.

He shifted down the skids to the top of the machine gun mounting in order to maintain fire on both ground positions.

Buckalew's fire killed one enemy soldier and neutralized the machine gun emplacement. This allowed the helicopter crew to repair the damage while in flight and leave the area safely.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up a House resolution (H. Res. 143) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 143

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: George H. Mahon (chairman), Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts; William H. Natcher, Kentucky; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; George E. Shipley, Illinois; John M. Slack, Jr., West Virginia; John J. Flynt, Jr., Georgia; Neal Smith, Iowa; Robert N. Giaimo, Connecticut; Julia Butler Hansen, Washington; Charles S. Joelson, New Jersey; Joseph P. Addabbo, New York; John J. McFall, California; W. R. Hull, Jr., Missouri; Jeffery Cohelan, California; Thomas G. Morris, New Mexico; Edward J. Patten, New Jersey; Clarence D. Long, Maryland; John O. Marsh, Jr., Virginia; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Bob Casey, Texas; David Pryor, Arkansas.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: L. Mendel Rivers (chairman), South Carolina; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Melvin Price, Illinois; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; Charles E. Bennett, Florida; James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; Samuel S. Stratton, New York; Otis G. Pike, New York; Richard H. Ichord, Missouri; Lucien N. Nedzi, Michigan; Alton Lennon, North Carolina; Wm. J. Randall, Missouri; G. Elliott Hagan, Georgia; Charles H. Wilson, California; Robert L. Leggett, California; Donald J. Irwin, Connecticut; Frank E. Evans, Colorado; Floyd V. Hicks, Washington; Hervey G. Machen, Maryland; Speedy O. Long, Louisiana; E. S. Johnny Walker, New Mexico.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION: Omar Burleson (chairman), Texas; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; Frank Thompson, Jr., New Jersey; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; Joe D. Waggonner, Jr., Louisiana; John H. Dent, Pennsylvania; Sam M. Gibbons, Florida; Lucien N. Nedzi, Michigan; John Brademas, Indiana; John W. Davis, Georgia; Kenneth J. Gray, Illinois.

COMMITTEE ON RULES: William M. Colmar (chairman), Mississippi; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; James J. Delaney, New York; Richard Bolling, Missouri; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Massachusetts; B. F. Sisk, California; John Young, Texas; Claude Pepper, Florida; Spark M. Matsunaga, Hawaii; William R. Anderson, Tennessee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 144) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives;

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Frank T. Bow, Ohio; Charles Raper Jonas, North Carolina; Melvin R. Laird, Wisconsin; Elford A. Cederberg, Michigan; Glenard P. Lipscomb, California; John J. Rhodes, Arizona; William E. Minshall, Ohio; Robert H. Michel, Illinois; Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts; Odin Langen, Minnesota; Ben Reifel, South Dakota; Glenn R. Davis, Wisconsin; Howard W. Robison, New York; Garner E. Shriver, Kansas; Joseph M. McDade, Pennsylvania; Mark Andrews, North Dakota.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION: Glenard P. Lipscomb, California; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; Charles E. Chamberlain, Michigan; Charles E. Goodell, New York; Samuel L. Devine, Ohio; William L. Dickinson, Alabama; Barber B. Conable, Jr., New York; James C. Cleveland, New Hampshire.

COMMITTEE ON RULES: H. Allen Smith, California; John B. Anderson, Illinois; Dave Martin, Nebraska; James H. Quillen, Tennessee; Delbert L. Latta, Ohio.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the life and service of the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, it is given to few men to be so honored as JOHN E. FOGARTY. The list of his awards, citations, and distinctions is symbolic of the wide range of his life's work. But even more is it the silent testimony of the respect and affection in which he was held by every institution and organization concerned—as he was concerned—with the alleviation of human suffering and the advancement of the knowledge and happiness of mankind.

Yet no one ever cared less for titles and testimonials than JOHN FOGARTY. From my earliest recollection of him and in all the time in which I had the privilege of being his junior colleague in this House, I was always impressed by his inherent modesty—just as I was inspired by the high goals he set for himself as a public servant and the vigor with which he pursued them. He was a man who honestly wanted to leave the world a little better for his having lived in it.

And he sought no trophies of his own for the victories he helped to win against poverty, ignorance, disease, and the waste of human resources.

There was, however, one tribute given to JOHN FOGARTY which, we may believe, must have touched his spirit with joy. As his body passed through the streets of Providence and Cranston in his native State, a hush came over the usually noisy thoroughfares as groups of people lined the way through the cities and into the cemetery in a spontaneous demonstration of sorrow and affection unlike any ever witnessed in Rhode Island. Construction workers removed their helmets in respect—and some wept—as he passed to his rest. Housewives, children, factory workers—all sorts and conditions of men and women waited along the way, for the funeral procession of JOHN FOGARTY became a living testimonial coming from the hearts of those for whom he had indeed been "Everybody's Congressman."

We in Rhode Island take justified pride in the contributions which the smallest of its States has made to the growth and progress of this, the greatest of nations. Yet, I believe that it is no exaggeration to say that the thousands of Rhode Islanders who paid their tribute to JOHN FOGARTY in his death were rightly convinced that when the judgment of history is taken, his life will be counted among the most outstanding of all of our State's gifts to America and to the cause of human progress.

Much has been said—and rightly said—of his many-sided interest in the cause of health and medical research. His own great heart drove him with a consuming desire to bring the resources of government to bear upon the ravages of disease. How successful he was in this effort, I need not tell the Members of this House. As Dr. Howard A. Rusk has observed in a recent column, it does seem most ironic that JOHN FOGARTY should have fallen victim to a heart attack, just as he was preparing a new campaign to win continued support for his efforts to aid medical science in its unending battle against diseases of the heart and other major causes of untimely death.

But that is the way JOHN FOGARTY would have wanted to face death, which must come to all men. He was a determined fighter for anything in which he believed, just as he was a formidable adversary against anything to which he was opposed. And he died as he lived: a man in the midst of the struggle against pain, darkness, and mortal despair.

The range of his action in that struggle went far beyond the borders of medical science and public health. When he first came to this House in the 27th year of his life, he came out of the ranks of organized labor. He was a worker and a craftsman, a builder and a bricklayer whose strong hands never lost their ability with tools; and he was a union member whose commitment to social justice never faltered. The structure of labor-management relations has surely progressed in this country in the past quarter of a century, and JOHN FOGARTY has left his craftsman's mark upon that progress.

He came from a great industrial State, and he fought to protect and to foster its industry. Yet he was born in a rural town, with its historic New England sense of independence, and he always adhered to the belief that much of the mighty spirit of America must always find its sustenance in free agriculture.

He loved the open land, the hills, the ancient stone fences, the trout streams, the forests, and the volunteer fire companies of the area in which he grew to manhood. He loved, too, the winding coastline of Rhode Island: its sandy beaches, its fleets of small boats, its magnificent vistas of ocean and harbor. He naturally became a champion of the cause of preserving such resources, and he brought Rhode Island to a position of national leadership in exploring the fascinating world of marine biology, with all of its mystery and all of its promise of resources for the future sustenance of humanity.

He was not a man who was at home in the halls of academic learning, but there is surely no school at any level in this country, that has not benefited from his presence in this House as one who fought to gain support for the progress of learning in America. Just as he appreciated the importance of the sciences so he also was an early leader in the effort to establish national institutes for the arts and the humanities. And the universities which never knew him as a student came to honor him as a benefactor because he was a legislator who understood both their value and their needs.

Yes, JOHN FOGARTY was the force behind legislation for medical research, for hospitals, for institutions to aid the mentally retarded and the mentally ill. But the range of his action extended to every area and problem of vital importance to American society today. The war on poverty was no political slogan to him. It was a war in which he had been fighting for years. And if he were standing here today, he would surely be telling us that just as we must find the strength to win the battle for peace and freedom in Vietnam so we must also continue to fight the battle for social justice and progress at home. He saw America as being engaged in a two-front struggle, and he believed that we could not afford to falter or to fail in the ultimate issue.

To me, JOHN FOGARTY was a father in this House; he was a guide and a counsellor whose experience was an invaluable source of growth and strength. We will not soon see another like him; but if we would pay him tribute, I am sure that he would ask that it be not in rhetoric but in continuing the work which he died doing.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include certain pertinent matter:

The eulogy delivered by Rev. Joseph L. Lennon, O. P., dean of Providence College at the Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul in Providence, R.I., on January 13, 1967.

The invocation delivered by the Rev. Vincent C. Dore, O.P., chancellor of Providence College, on January 10, 1967.

"A Life Well Spent" from the Providence Visitor, January 13, 1967.

"He Made His Record True" from the Observer of January 12, 1967.

"Mr. Public Health" from the New York Times of January 15, 1967.

"JOHN FOGARTY: His Word Was His Pledge" from the Providence Journal, January 11, 1967.

"JOHN FOGARTY'S Priceless Bequest" from the Pawtucket Times, January 11, 1967.

An article from the New York Times dated January 11, 1967.

An article from the Hartford Courant dated January 14, 1967.

"A Crusader Is Gone" from the East Providence Post, January 12, 1967.

An article from the Woonsocket Call dated January 11, 1967.

"JOHN E. FOGARTY, A Great Loss" from the Pawtuxet Valley Daily Times, January 14, 1967.

An article from the Sun, Westerly, R.I., dated January 11, 1967.

An article from the Narragansett Times dated January 12, 1967.

An article from the Providence Evening Bulletin dated January 14, 1967.

An article from the Washington News dated January 11, 1967.

"Tributes to JOHN E. FOGARTY" from the Providence Evening Bulletin, January 16, 1967.

EULOGY OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY AT CATHEDRAL OF STS. PETER AND PAUL, PROVIDENCE, R.I., JANUARY 13, 1967

(Preacher: Rev. Joseph L. Lennon, O.P., Dean, Providence College)

"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord. From henceforth now, saith the spirit, that they may rest from their labors; for their works follow them." (Book of the Apocalypse 14:13)

Let me state at once: we are not here to canonize John Fogarty, but in the words of St. Paul to "give honor where honor is due." He would not want it otherwise. Saints, I am sure we have among us, but John Fogarty would be the last person to place a halo on his head. Mere words of praise which never meant much to him when he was living would mean even less now that he is dead. Rather he would have us look upon his presence here before the altar as his last opportunity to speak to us, not of himself, but of the great loves that dominated his life: love for his family, relatives and friends, love for his church, his country and his countrymen, love for his fellow man, especially the poor, the sick, the ignorant, the handicapped, the downtrodden wherever they might be.

I know his first thought on this occasion would go out to his stricken relatives, his wife Luise, his daughter Mary, his brothers, his sister and their families. Great is their sorrow, but greater still is their faith. To them we offer our sincere sympathy. May the God of all consolation fill up with His presence the great void left by his death. May God's grace help all those who love him bear this heavy sorrow.

William James once said "The purpose of life is to spend it for something that outlives you." No man finds his ultimate end in himself. John Fogarty knew this. He realized that the secret of a healthy mind and a happy life lies in the principle of sharing with others, in building one's life on the ideal of service.

When a person applies his mind to the needs and welfare of others he becomes alert, active, joyful and interested in life. His world becomes full of real people, not merely walking shadows. He begins to have an

actual investment in persons so that what they do, or fail to do, how they fare or how they suffer, becomes vitally important to him.

John Fogarty spent himself for others. He thought of his life as a contribution. The harder he worked the more he contributed. But to what was this contribution made? To think that he had added to the possibilities of happiness for mankind must have pleased him. But this was not enough. He knew that the sum total of human beings considered as such has no real existence. It exists, if at all, only in the individuals who compose it, and of these the self is one. But there is no absolute reason why one mortal being should work and sacrifice for another, or for two or three, or as many as you will, if all are mortal, and all sacrifice ends in death, beyond which there is nothing more.

If beyond all temporal rewards, however, there are eternal values, if society has a final end, unseen indeed, but towards which it is ever advancing through war and pestilence and social conflict, and if this end will not pass with the passing of time, but by that very passing attain its eternal expression, then whatever the individual does in furthering the work of the social order has absolute and eternal value. To realize this, even as a possibility, brings a new glimmer of hope into the human mind. To know it with the assurance of faith plants in the mind principles that dominate conduct.

This is how John Fogarty knew it. He saw the value of his work in the great scheme of things. He looked upon his efforts as a contribution to a work that will never die. Disappointments and frustrations he bore with patient equanimity because he knew that one must suffer to the end that a life's work may be finished and an unselfish contribution made to the welfare of humanity and to that eternal order which the Supreme Intelligence is establishing in a world of intelligent beings.

It is a rare person who can hold the same office for twenty-six years without becoming stale and unyielding in his ideas, who can keep a lively interest in life and its changes while keeping a watchful eye on values that never change. John Fogarty won the respect of his colleagues, and the esteem of all humanitarians, by his interest in and knowledge of the ever developing sciences dealing with health, education and welfare. He grew with his job. With all his busyness, with all his talking at Junior high schools, granges, churches, colleges, fraternal clubs and organizations, with all his activity on behalf of the mentally retarded and other worthy causes, yes, and even as a champion of Ireland and Irishmen, with all the many, many demands upon his time and charitable nature, he still exposed himself to ideas and listened to the counsel of the learned. And so he matured, and as he matured, the Country and the American people reaped the benefit of his experience and wisdom.

But this politician in the green bow tie was also fully human. The faults of a strong and fiery temperament were ever present in his character. On occasion, he could be obstinate, domineering, belligerent, argumentative, strong in his dislikes, fierce in his loyalties, sharply critical in his remarks. But would you deny an Irish bricklayer these very human traits, traits which became virtues when he used them in relentless pursuit of the appropriations for the health and welfare projects he loved so dearly. This man never looked for a fight, but he never dodged one. He followed the advice of Theodore Roosevelt, "Let us not shrink from strife, provided we are certain that strife is justified." Strife was justified, in John Fogarty's mind, wherever the health and welfare of the American people were at stake, and he would fight to the bitter end for the money needed for critical projects. Moral courage like this should not pass unnoticed.

Some have mourned that this patriot who labored so hard to stretch the life span of our citizens should die so young. But the poet tells us:

"Who well lives, long lives; for this age of ours
Should not be numbered by years, days and hours."

"The point is," says Seneca, "not how long you live, but how nobly you live." John Fogarty's life provides a history of noble living and accomplishment. He did not merely talk about serving mankind, he did something about it. In this, he was a good Christian, for Christ's doctrine is not just an abstraction, a lovely theory, pretty myth. It expresses itself in action. To illustrate what He meant by a good neighbor, Christ related the story of the Good Samaritan who actually helped the man waylaid by robbers. John Fogarty was a good samaritan. He was "his brother's keeper," and went to great lengths to demonstrate his active love for neighbor. The spirit of this statesman deserves to live on—and it will live on. It will live on in every medical researcher at the National Institutes of Health who works to stamp out disease. It will live on in every college and professional school where students work under grants made possible by this lawmaker. It will live on in every person who is the beneficiary of the Fogarty life and who relates the work he is doing, however small, to the common welfare of his country.

Every person has to come to terms, in his own way, with death. John Fogarty came to terms with death fifteen years ago when he suffered a heart attack. He knew he was living on borrowed time and he made the most of every minute. The thought of death, or even the prospect of it, does not essentially change the Christian relationship to any given moment. "Do what you're doing," is a basic principle of the spiritual life. For anyone, like John Fogarty, who is convinced of the transcendent value of the "here and now," the job at hand, the daily work is the important thing. He never worried about the future. He left it in God's hands and got on with what he was doing.

The combination of work in the present and trust in God's grace for the future had become a settled habit of mind with John Fogarty. He never complained about his health because he believed that he would be called in God's good time. It was this duty, this joy, this sorrow, this project that engrossed his attention. He made the most of the present. He had come to terms with death because he had come to terms with Christ. Realist that he was, he took at face value the words of Jesus Christ when He said, "I am the Resurrection and the Life; he who believeth in Me, although he be dead, shall live: and every one who liveth and believeth in Me shall not die forever."

To John Fogarty we say:

"Life's race well run
Life's work well done
Life's victory won
Now cometh rest."

"Almighty and Eternal God, we invoke Your blessing upon us as we pay solemn tribute to the memory of an illustrious American, a distinguished son of our great State and a loyal and dear friend, the Honorable United States Congressman, John Edward Fogarty.

"His twenty-six years of dedicated service in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States merited for him national acclaim and the established reputation as 'the Champion of Better Health for the Nation.' As a member of the Appropriations Committee for almost two decades, he sponsored liberal federal grants for medical education and research; and for extensive public health services for the departments of Labor and of Health, Education and Welfare.

"His constant championship in the cause of improved health for all the people of our Nation acclaimed him the worthy recipient of innumerable awards and honors. From the mouths of little children, from the physically handicapped and the mentally retarded, from the debilitated aged, from men and women of all ages and of every race, color, and creed, he truly merited the honorable title of 'Mr. Public Health' and received their highest economia and most cherished awards.

"He ennobled our Nation and the world by his constant adherence to the principles of liberty, justice, and equality and their application to all men and nations.

"As we bow our heads in sorrow, let us lift up our hearts to The God of all hope and consolation and ask Almighty God to sustain and comfort in their great loss—his devoted wife, Luise; his loving daughter, Mary Louise; his sister, Margaret; and his four brothers, William, Raymond, Dr. Frank, and Charles. Great is the sea of their sorrow, but like John E. Fogarty, great also is their faith. To them we offer our deepest sympathy.

"John Edward Fogarty was one of God's great noblemen. A dedicated statesman, a learned legislator, and a cherished dear friend. May his memory ever be held in benediction for his many noble deeds and magnanimous benefactions for the people of Rhode Island, the Nation, and the world. May his immortal soul rest in peace. Amen."

By the Very Rev. Vincent C. Dore, O.P. Chancellor of Providence College, Providence, Rhode Island, on the occasion of the death of Congressman John E. Fogarty, January 10, 1967.

[From the Providence Visitor, Jan. 13, 1967]

A LIFE WELL SPENT

The life of John E. Fogarty was the life of a man who loved justice, did works of mercy, and walked humbly with his God.

He loved justice, for he began his political career as a champion of those who labor for their living. There are few advances in better labor-management legislation in the past two decades with which he was not closely and actively identified. He remained to the end a public leader who honestly believed that the war against poverty, prejudice, and the ignorance which deprives people of equal opportunity is the most important war this nation has to fight. He was known for his devotion to the historic traditions of Ireland's long battle for freedom; but he was a man who was never limited by ethnic boundaries, and he was among the first to rise up against injustice wherever it was being done.

He was moved by mercy, and it is this aspect of his life which commanded the attention of so many in recent years. No one will ever be able to measure the extent of the role he played in the advancement of medical research, the conquest of diseases of the mind and body, and the opening up of medical care to millions of people of all ages. His role in the World Health Organization made him an international figure, who worked diligently to serve the cause of health and peace. And he was as sensitive to the anguish of deprived and famished children in India as he was ready to work to relieve suffering that was closer to home.

He walked humbly with his God, and many an early morning saw him on the streets of Washington quietly walking to Mass before beginning his long day's work. He did not wear his religion on his sleeve, nor did he seek recognition for his loyalty to his Church. He was a Christian man, who in the world of labor, health, education, and social welfare, lived the life of commitment to others. As he deeply admired Pope John XXIII and as he profoundly valued his friendship with

John F. Kennedy, so may we believe and hope that he shares their joyful company in the eternity of the God he humbly served.

[From the Observer, Jan. 12, 1967]

HE MADE HIS RECORD TRUE

A man's fame is measured by the number of words which are spoken about him or written about him during his lifetime and at his death, but the measure of his greatness is the love and genuine esteem in which he is held by his fellow man. John Fogarty's achievements brought fame and gave him rank among the greatest Americans of the decade, but his boundless capacity for friendship and his loyalty to the hundreds of people who called themselves his friends—this was the nature of his greatness.

Famous people often have trouble with their laurels, but John Fogarty never did. He wore his laurels like a prince, never boasting about them, but never belittling them either. And when, as so often happens to important people, others lavished him with excessive adulation, the twinkle in his eye gave notice that though the praise was appreciated, it would never be allowed to rule the man.

Through the years of his service in Congress as he became better and better known and admired throughout the nation by dozens of important segments of the professional world, doctors, psychologists, educators, welfare works, librarians, conservationists, to name a few—John Fogarty never changed as an individual—never grew away from his friends, always looked forward to seeing them and talking with them when he was home in Rhode Island. What's more, he had the gracious gift when conversing with people of being able to make them forget he had become such an important personage. His warmth and sincerity were the shield which protected them from feeling they must treat him with awe.

So, on Tuesday morning when it was first heard in his home town area that John Fogarty had been stricken while in his office in Washington, the first reaction was to pray it was some mistake. Then, as succeeding newscasts on radio and television left no room for doubt, the sad word spread on lightning wings. But as neighbor told neighbor, the facts were relayed not coldly as mere news, not sensationally for the sake of effect, but quietly, with the kind of genuine feeling that is usually reserved for the loss of a relative or a very close friend. And that is exactly the way people thought of John Fogarty. Though he really wasn't, couldn't be, everyone's close friend, somehow he did seem so, to so many.

As the presidential plane swept onto the runway bringing John Fogarty back home on Tuesday evening, we thought not only of all the people who felt they had lost a close friend but also of all those who would be losing their hopes and dreams as well, for untold hundreds, not only in his home State, but also throughout the nation have gotten into the habit of depending on John Fogarty to make their dreams come true. Parents of retarded children have found new hope; little struggling country libraries have realized their dreams of better community service; workers in various fields of research and people engaged in endeavors for the welfare of others everywhere have looked to him to carry their banners, to push legislation which has made it possible for them to start or enrich their programs for the good of mankind. And on many a winter night, just like last Tuesday evening, John Fogarty had either enplaned or landed at the same State airport carrying in his brief case and in his heart, the hopes and dreams of others.

As a nation we can be proud of this American. As a State we have been fortunate to have him identified as ours. As neighbors it has been a wonderful thing for all of us to have been his friends.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 15, 1967]

MR. PUBLIC HEALTH—DEATH ENDS LONG FIGHT BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY TO GIVE AMERICA FREEDOM FROM DISEASE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

If hospitals, research laboratories and institutes for the aged, infirm and retarded had flagpoles, every flag would have flown at half-staff this past week to mourn the loss of John E. Fogarty.

Representative Fogarty of Rhode Island died of a heart attack last Tuesday at the age of 53.

Flags at half-staff would not, however, been limited to institutions. They would also have been in evidence in thousands of homes throughout Rhode Island and the nation.

Mr. Fogarty was not just interested in institutions and dollars. He was interested in people, and no appeal for help that went to his office was ever left unanswered. He would go to inordinate ends to try to find the solution to problems that were all too often insoluble.

No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

PLANNED NEW CRUSADE

Ironically, his death came just before he was to be sworn in for his 14th term—a time when he was mobilizing his forces for another all-out crusade against disease, disability and death.

Also ironically, his death was caused by a heart attack, his own personal public enemy number one as the primary killer of others.

The contribution of John Fogarty to improving health and rehabilitation services for the American people are legend.

When he entered Congress our Federal investment in medical research was but $3-million. It is now well over $1-billion.

During his freshman year in the House of Representatives, the number of disabled persons rehabilitated into employment under the public program was but 12,000. Last year it was more than 154,000.

Medicare, Medicaid, more nursing home beds, Federal aid for the training of physicians and other health workers, the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health, workshops and classrooms for the mentally retarded and all of the other tremendous advances in health and rehabilitation in the last quarter century stand as monuments to this late "Mr. Public Health."

He and his co-worker in the Senate, Senator Lister Hill from Alabama, were recognized as the great health leaders of all time. They complemented and supplemented each other in their continuing fight for the fifth freedom—freedom from disease.

STARTED AS BRICKLAYER

Mr. Fogarty's formal education ended when he received his high school diploma. He immediately followed in the footsteps of his father and older brother and became an apprentice bricklayer.

He was only 27 when he was first elected to Congress from Rhode Island. During World War II he served as an enlisted man in the Navy construction corps. After the war he returned to Congress to carry the torch for the enlisted men in the armed forces.

Having been denied a formal education and a college degree, he made possible through his untiring efforts the education of literally thousands of others as physicians, scientists and technicians because he cared.

Some years ago Mr. Fogarty was challenged with the opportunity to run for the Senate from Rhode Island. After a great deal of discussion with his friends and colleagues he decided his destiny was in the House of Representatives where he could continue his fight for health as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Health, Education and Welfare.

This was a decision that for suffering humanity was a blessed one.

John Fogarty, who started as a bricklayer, ended his career by placing countless bricks in a solid foundation of modern laboratories, medical schools, hospitals, institutions for the mentally ill and the retarded, and research laboratories that extend from the halls of science to the community itself.

With his bright green tie and his Irish accent, he was a circuit rider for health, a teacher, a preacher, a fearless foe to any challenger who stood in the way of his crusade.

He died on the field of battle. His friends from the scientist to the sick mourn his loss and call him blessed.

[From the Providence Journal, Jan 11, 1967]

JOHN FOGARTY: HIS WORD WAS HIS PLEDGE

A man does not easily earn the respect and stature that were rightfully Congressman John E. Fogarty's as he prepared yesterday to be sworn into office from the Second District of the State of Rhode Island for the 14th consecutive term. Death cut short a career of public accomplishment that honored him and the state he served.

In Washington, Mr. Fogarty was known as Mr. Public Health, and his record of achievement in promoting federally financed medical research programs was spectacular. By persuasive pleading and carefully documented statements of need, he led the way in Congress for remarkable expansion of the work of the National Institutes of Health.

The congressman was not an orator in the traditional Washington sense. He was at his most effective best in committee rooms, in lobbies, and in the give-and-take of debate and personal appeal. Of retiring nature, the warmth of his personality helped to enlist the support he needed among fellow congressmen.

His word was a pledge of honor. In a city like Washington where high courage often is necessary for a man to keep his word under trying circumstances, Congressman Fogarty never faltered. Having made up his mind on a course of action and having promised to follow through, he never abandoned his purpose, no matter how great the pressure to change.

This quality of unshakable firmness in defense of a position he believed to be correct never showed more clearly than it did in early 1962 when he rejected a personal appeal from the late President Kennedy at a White House meeting for support of a crop control bill Mr. Kennedy wanted. An admirer of Mr. Kennedy, he eschewed the status of follower.

The congressman disliked ostentation, personal or public. His sole piece of showmanship was the bright green bow tie he wore, and it reflected a deep personal affection for the land of his family's origin. At one time, in 1950, he first amused, then astounded Congress by winning preliminary House approval of a ban on foreign aid to Great Britain.

Mr. Fogarty, without specifically referring to Great Britain, won early passage of an appropriations bill amendment which would have cut off aid until the partition of Ireland was ended. The House reversed itself two days later, but Mr. Fogarty had made his point, a point to which he held consistently all his life.

But if Mr. Fogarty won national note for his work in promoting health research programs, he kept a strong and solid base of political power here in Rhode Island. Mr. Fogarty did not campaign in the traditional fashion; he kept himself in the current of Rhode Island life every day of the year.

The congressman maintained remarkably close touch with his constituency; he was as ready to take a ride in Wickford Harbor for

a first-hand look at a dredging problem as he was to meet with the parents of mentally retarded children, interested in furthering research in that problem and developing care facilities for mentally retarded youngsters.

Repeatedly, he turned back Republican opposition by substantial margins; to run against him required considerable courage and a high quotient of hope. He was an astute observer of the national political scene; a strong Democrat, he had an independence of mind which prevented him, for instance, from becoming a "Johnson man."

Mr. Fogarty began his congressional career as do many bright young men; a little brash, perhaps, proud of a record already rooted in Rhode Island life. But he matured with experience, and he gave his constituency and his state a powerful voice in the House and won him honors far beyond the boundaries of this smallest state in the Union.

There was a time when Congressman Fogarty might have been governor; another time, he might have been a United States senator. That he elected to remain in the House reflects his judgment of where he thought he best could serve his country. It will be no easy task for the voters of his district to fill the seat John E. Fogarty filled with such dedication.

[From the Pawtucket Times, Jan. 11, 1967]

JOHN E. FOGARTY'S PRICELESS BEQUEST

John E. Fogarty was an eager 26-year-old when he first raised his hand in the halls of Congress and took the oath of office. Perhaps, too, he was a bit awestruck and perplexed that day in 1941 to find himself in such stately surroundings—and he could not be blamed. For only months before, he was toiling at the bricklayer's trade that his father had plied before him.

But the understandable perplexity would soon yield to a purposeful and constructive program that would catapult this son of Rhode Island into national and even international prominence. In the ensuing 26 years, John Fogarty would make the fields of health and welfare his special domain and all the ills plaguing mankind, young and old, his special target. The success of his efforts are his legacy, not merely to his fellow Rhode Islanders but to all Americans, for his work transcended congressional district lines, community lines, and state boundaries. His is a legacy partly of brick and mortar, for buildings that stand as monuments to his work have risen in Bethesda . . . in Kingston . . . in Exeter. But, more, his legacy is the visible inroads into the bastions of disease that will one day ease the pains, the distress and the heartaches of countless millions. A finer bequest to one's fellow man can hardly be imagined.

Mr. Fogarty was eloquent proof that one man can indeed make a better world.

When the news of his death spread throughout the state on Tuesday, the phone in his office in the Custom House in Providence rang constantly, and those calling wept unashamedly as they tried to convey their feelings to Mr. Fogarty's associates. For in the long years that had passed since he first sought the office, he had become a singular public servant, respected for his dedication to his duties and possessing a warm interest in the well-being of people that went beyond political lines. The Congress post he first won from Harry Sandager in 1940 was the only office he ever sought, and all 12 men who later tried to wrest it from him failed. Yet, his defeated opponents became his fast friends. Never in his 14 campaigns did he talk in derogatory terms about his opponent, a tactic rare in the political arena, and friendships flourished in the aftermath of elections.

Congressman Fogarty was not the elected official who represented the Pawtucket area residents—but represent them he did, and many more. He served with distinction and reflected untold credit upon his native state. Through his personal efforts, the World Health Organization—four different presidents appointed him to attend its gatherings in Geneva—will hold its 1968 session in Boston, Mr. Fogarty's tribute to the latter city as a world medical center.

One of mankind's most ruthless foes has felled the man who rallied the nation's resources against it, and other diseases. It is tragic that he felt its blow at so young an age with so much work ahead. Yet even so he waged the long fight well, and when the day of victory dawns, the name of Congressman John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island will be accorded the respect due a pioneer who won't be there but without whom there would have been no conquest.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 11, 1967]

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN FOGARTY DIES AT 53; CHAMPIONED U.S. HEALTH AID—RHODE ISLAND DEMOCRAT LED FIGHT FOR MORE FUNDS—IN HOUSE SINCE 1941

WASHINGTON, January 10.—Representative John E. Fogarty, Democrat of Rhode Island, died in his office today, apparently of a heart attack, shortly before he was to have been sworn in for his 14th term. He was 53 years old.

The House which normally meets and adjourns quickly following the death of a Representative, met as scheduled because new members were to be sworn at the session, and such meetings are mandatory.

"MR. PUBLIC HEALTH"

As Representative from Rhode Island's Second Congressional District since 1941, John Edward Fogarty achieved renown as a successful sponsor of massive Federal spending for medical research, public health and aid to the mentally retarded.

Chairman since 1949 of what is now the House Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, Mr. Fogarty pressed for appropriations totaling into the billions, even when his own Democratic administration had not budgeted them.

In 1961, Mr. Fogarty accused President Kennedy of having dealt a "devastating blow" to cancer research by seeking to trim $60 million from the budget of the National Institutes of Health. Mr. Fogarty chose a national cancer conference to make his charge. Later, he led the fight for restoration of the cut in Congress.

In 1965, when President Johnson signed a health research facilities act in a public ceremony at the National Institutes, Mr. Fogarty told the President that "we would have had more if you hadn't cut the funds."

WON SPECIAL LASKER AWARD

Honored many times, Mr. Fogarty received the Distinguished Service Award of the American Cancer Society in 1952, the first award of the National Association for Retarded Children in 1956, the National Distinguished Service Medal of Parent's Magazine and the National Rehabilitation Association's annual award.

In 1959, he was given, along with Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, one of two special Lasker Awards for "extraordinary public service." The awards, established by the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation in 1946, are presented annually by the American Public Health Association and are seldom given to nonprofessional persons.

A health-science laboratory building at the University of Rhode Island, a hospital at the Doctor Joseph H. Ladd School for the Retarded and a center for retarded children in Providence all bear his name.

The stocky, grayish Mr. Fogarty was known around Washington as "Mr. Public Health." As a public speaker, he was warm and persuasive without being oratorical. Newsweek magazine once described him as "immensely popular with his fellow Congressmen, soft-spoken and retiring (except for his bright green bow ties)."

The green emphasized his tie to the Old Sod, although he was born in Providence. In 1950, Mr. Fogarty created a stir when he sought to cut off Marshall Plan foreign-aid funds to Britain until the partition of Ireland was ended. The House first approved the amendment but defeated it before it could become law.

Mr. Fogarty's greatest effort and achievements were in furthering medical research. But, he said, "Nothing happened to me as a kid that made me decide medicine must be important."

Mr. Fogarty, who was born March 23, 1913, ended his formal education with high school. Then, following the lead of his father and older brother, William, he became an apprentice bricklayer. He was only 23 when he was elected to the first of four one-year terms as president of the Bricklayers Union Number 1 of Rhode Island, and only 27 when he won election to Congress.

ENLISTED IN NAVY

Late in his second term, on Dec. 7, 1944, he enlisted, incognito, in the Navy's Construction Corps. Because of his membership on the Committee of Naval Affairs, he wanted to observe the problems of enlisted men first hand, and as an enlisted man, worked on Guam.

Returning to Washington in 1945, he announced his intention to "make himself the enlisted man's legman." He sought membership on the Appropriation Committee's subcommittee dealing with the naval budget because Rhode Island has a number of naval installations. Instead, he was placed on the labor and health, education and welfare subcommittee. In 1949, he became its chairman.

Mr. Fogarty, who still carried his union bricklayer's card, lived for many years in Harmony, a small Rhode Island village.

Mr. Fogarty is survived by his widow, the form Luise Rohland; his daughter, Mary Louise; four brothers, William, Raymond, T. Francis and Charles Fogarty, and a sister, Miss Margaret A. Fogarty.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Jan. 14, 1967]

CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY OF RHODE ISLAND

Recent Congressional incidents have all conspired to build in the public mind the image of a Congressman as a free-wheeling cadger. And yet, the death of such a Congressman as John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island is a sharp reminder that while there are sinners in Congress, there are some who come close to being saints. Mr. Fogarty was a rough-hewn, solid man who was trained as a bricklayer. He later became the business agent of the union, and soon, even as a young man, gained a reputation for his fairness, intelligence and integrity.

These were qualities he maintained until his death. From the moment he entered Congress three decades ago until the very last, Mr. Fogarty devoted himself with earnest intensity to the promotion of all measures furthering medical research, better medical care, and increased appropriations for the various governmental units that were concerned with public health. He was particularly active in promoting better care for the mentally retarded. In his native state, with quiet affection, they usually referred to him as "Doctor" John.

Unlike some representatives who think of themselves first, Mr. Fogarty thought first of the public good. And his record in promoting wholesome legislation was as solid as some of the brick walls he once built. The people knew it, and if he had lived, Mr. Fogarty could have stayed on in Congress for as long as he liked. Such quietly effective public servants are the backbone of Congress.

[From the East Providence Post, Jan. 12, 1967]

A CRUSADER IS GONE

Congressman John E. Fogarty will go down in history as one of this country's greatest crusaders in the fight for public health.

The 53-year old senior congressman, because of a firm foothold on Capital Hill, was able to secure passage on many major and vital health measures. This includes such legislation as the heart, stroke and cancer act and also an act providing increased care for the mentally retarded.

Mentally retarded children always held a soft spot in John Fogarty's heart. Nobody ever learned why. He went out of his way on hundreds of occasions to lend support to programs and facilities that would help make this world a better place for these unfortunate persons to live in.

It is ironic that Mr. Fogarty died of a heart attack at the prime of his career. Heart disease is one that he had been continually fighting to cure. Funds for medical research on heart disease always rated a high priority on his public health list.

It will be quite some time before any Rhode Island representative receives the seniority and stature that Mr. Fogarty attained in the House. Because of his untiring efforts in the health field, he was named chairman of the powerful subcommittee on Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare.

Perhaps not too many persons realize it, but millions of dollars in federal funds for hundreds of state, city and town projects throughout Rhode Island were granted only through the help of Congressman Fogarty.

If a city or town in his congressional district had a project that required federal funds for it to become a reality, Mr. Fogarty was always there to make sure the funds were unleashed, if at all possible. More than likely, the project was completed and the congressman was on hand for its dedication.

Congressman Fogarty, the man with the green bow tie, will be missed to be sure.

[From the Woonsocket Call and Evening Reporter, Jan. 11, 1967]

JOHN E. FOGARTY

John E. Fogarty was a Congressman who tended carefully to his own constituency. He was extremely popular, as the big votes that returned him to office for so many terms indicate. His sudden passing in his Washington office just hours before the 90th Congress was due to convene came as a distinct shock.

The victim of a heart condition, Congressman Fogarty for some time had immersed himself in matters pertaining to health, especially on a national scale. He had won a multitude of honors for his work in the various fields of health and medicine. On the local scene he was a staunch supporter of the new Mercy Hospital for which he was able to obtain federal funds.

Proud of his Irish heritage, John Fogarty was equally proud of his background as a former bricklayer, like his father before him. As a politician he understood the needs of his fellow citizens and his own town of Glocester, a rock-ribbed Republican stronghold, biennially switched to the Democratic column to vote for its son.

John Fogarty was particularly esteemed in the higher echelons of the Democratic Party. A close associate of the late President Kennedy, he was reported to have rejected the offer of a cabinet post—Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare—to devote his time and talents to his Rhode Island constituency.

His passing came too soon and too suddenly and is a loss to Rhode Island and the nation.

[From the Pawtuxet Valley Daily Times, Jan. 14, 1967]

JOHN E. FOGARTY, A GREAT LOSS

This week Rhode Islanders lost to death one of the most distinguished citizens and respected legislators in the history of the state. And the death of Rep. John E. Fogarty was a loss felt far beyond the borders of this state. Overwhelming testimony to that has been given in the past few days in the tributes of leaders in politics, education and the health professions. Their tributes voiced what is evident in the record of the man during the quarter of a century he served in the United States House of Representatives.

In this special area of interest, research in the health sciences and improvement of health services for the nation's men, women and children, no legislator has achieved a better record. The tributes of the great were well deserved.

But the most significant and enduring marks of affection and loss were to be found in the manifestations of grief from the "little" people—at the airport as the plane from Washington brought John Fogarty home, at the wake, in the state capitol as the body lay in state, at the funeral service in the Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul.

It is, after all, the people who have lost a friend and champion. Although the scientists, the doctors, and the educators and their research were aided directly by John Fogarty's dedication to the providing of greater means for them to wage the war against disease, it was the people whose interests he was ultimately serving.

Nowhere in his district will Rep. John E. Fogarty be missed more than in the Pawtuxet Valley. Many individuals and groups can vouch for his genuine interest in them and aid to them. It is fulsome and therefore does no credit to a man's memory to insinuate that he is irreplaceable. Rhode Island's Second Congressional District will be served well again. There are obviously capable men in both parties. But it is virtually a certainty that no Congressman—from Rhode Island or any other state—will ever quite achieve the stature of John E. Fogarty in legislative service to the health needs of the American people.

[From the Westerly (R.I.) Sun, Jan. 11, 1967]

JOHN E. FOGARTY

The unexpected death yesterday morning of Congressman John E. Fogarty is a loss that will be felt in practically every Rhode Island home. But his death is a far greater loss to the millions of Americans across the nation. Among his mourners will be the aged from coast-to-coast, the mentally retarded from Canada to Mexico, and everyone afflicted in one way or another with a heart ailment.

John Fogarty, with his Kelly-green bow tie, was a well known and respected figure—in Westerly, in the Congress of the United States, and everywhere across the country when the health of the people was an issue.

As a Republican, it is sometimes difficult to look across the political fence and see the true man in the Democrat camp. One's view is often dimmed by political bigotry. It is equally hard for a Democrat to see the true picture within his own camp. He would be too close to John Fogarty—a veteran of 25 years in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Probably our closest personal association with John Fogarty came a few years ago through a letter requesting an appointment to West Point for our son. The same letter went to both Senators representing the Westerly area. John Fogarty granted a Principal Appointment to the son of a Republican when he could just as easily have given him an Alternate Appointment. Later we were to learn from a locally prominent Democrat that John Fogarty had put his political career on the block by doing so.

To date, John Fogarty's faith in a boy of opposite political belief has paid off. He is a West Point graduate, a qualified paratrooper, Ranger, and Company Commander in the 1st Armored Division. He is also a Viet Nam volunteer.

This we believe, is one small item of service in the life of John Fogarty—a servant of all Rhode Islanders. We shan't forget him.

C.W.U.

[From the Narragansett Times, Jan. 12, 1967]

SOUTH COUNTY IS INDEBTED TO REPRESENTATIVE JOHN E. FOGARTY

The death of Rep. John E. Fogarty Tuesday came as a severe blow to the state of Rhode Island, and for South County, which the congressman visited often and served so well, there was also a sense of personal loss.

Mr. Fogarty, who represented the state for 26 years in Congress before his untimely death, only last autumn completed one of his most important tasks for Narragansett, getting federal approval for the North End water system.

Municipal officials acknowledge that without Mr. Fogarty's assistance, the project would probably still be no further toward approval than it was four years ago.

In the days just prior to the government's announcement of its approval of the project, Mr. Fogarty worked feverishly to open doors in Washington locked to officials on the local level. He had committed himself to getting the project approved, and was not about to take no for an answer. He did not have to.

The congressman was also instrumental, a few years ago, in getting federal approval for an access to the new South Kingstown police station off the new U.S. Rte. 1. Town officials were pleased with the site, and with Mr. Fogarty's help were able to put it to use.

His contributions as a leader in the field of mental health and medicine were rewarded in 1964, when the University of Rhode Island gave his name to its new health sciences center.

Today, we in South County are the poorer for his passing, but the richer for having had as our man in Washington, John Fogarty, Everybody's Congressman.

[From the Providence Evening Bulletin, Jan. 14, 1967]

"BUILT HIS OWN TESTIMONIAL": EULOGIES CITE FOGARTY'S IMAGE

Members of the Rhode Island General Assembly yesterday eulogized Rep. John E. Fogarty as a congressman who represented everyone in Rhode Island and whose efforts in the fields of health and welfare benefited everyone in the country.

A resolution passed first by the House and then by the Senate praised Mr. Fogarty as a man whose "interests were always with the so-called working class, for he was a bricklayer before his election to Congress at the age of 27, and understood the problems of the working people.

"The name of John E. Fogarty is synonymous with the cause of health and welfare, for all his efforts have been directed in this area with outstanding results," the resolution said.

"Not only Rhode Island, but all states of the union have benefited from his dedicated endeavors in those fields, as evidenced by the innumerable awards made to him by civic, municipal and state organizations. His interest in the field of health and welfare was internationally recognized."

The Assembly eulogies and passage of the resolution followed Mr. Fogarty's funeral by a few hours. The funeral, held in the Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul, was witnessed by thousands of people.

Mr. Fogarty died Tuesday morning at his

office in Washington, hours before he was to be sworn in for his 14th term.

In Washington yesterday, four more senators paid tribute to Mr. Fogarty. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy of New York said the Kennedy family and all Americans will miss the Rhode Island congressman.

He recalled that Mr. Fogarty had neither permitted nor needed testimonials while in office—that he "built his own testimonial, laying bricks of solid achievement, mortared with care and love."

Sen. Jacob K. Javits, R–NY, recalled that he served in the House with Representative Fogarty and saw the "integrity, wisdom and devotion to principle with which he pursued his congressional career."

He said Mr. Fogarty "never forgot his early years as a bricklayer, remaining throughout his congressional career sensitive to the needs of those of modest means."

Sen. Harrison J. Williams, D-NJ, said Representative Fogarty had an unusual ability to "remain in touch with the people he served" and was effective in Congress first because he saw what needed to be done and then had the force of will of the knowledge needed to make things happen."

Sen. Daniel K. Inouye, D-Hawaii, said few men could match Mr. Fogarty's record and that "countless Americans, including the very old and the very young, are indebted to John Fogarty for his lifelong devotion to development and improvement of many national health programs."

The General Assembly resolution praising Rep. Fogarty was introduced by Rep. Joseph A. Bevilacqua of Providence, D-Dist. 13, and several other representatives of both parties. Many of them took the floor to pay tribute to the congressman.

PRAISED BY BEVILACQUA

Mr. Bevilacqua, majority leader, praised the congressman as one "who was concerned with the welfare of the poor, the sick and the infirm. Many of the things he has done and the legislation he has worked for will never be erased from the pages of history."

Rep. Oliver L. Thompson of Barrington, R-Dist. 88, minority leader, echoed Mr. Bevilacqua's sentiments and praised the eulogy delivered at Mr. Fogarty's funeral by the Rev. Joseph L. Lennon, dean of the college at Providence College.

He said the eulogy "was one of the most beautiful and expressive that could be given. It would be hard to top it."

WRENN PAYS TRIBUTE

House Speaker John J. Wrenn of Providence, D-Dist. 17, said he reacted to Mr. Fogarty's death in the same manner he had reacted to the death of President John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Fogarty, he said, "was the John F. Kennedy of Rhode Island." Mr. Wrenn said that Mr. Fogarty as a bricklayer must have taken great care to lay brick upon brick in a straight level row.

"This," Mr. Wrenn said, "is how he constructed his entire political career. He laid brick upon brick and built human welfare."

Fifteen senators and the presiding officer, Lt. Gov. Joseph H. O'Donnell, eulogized Mr. Fogarty in the upper branch of the legislature, on both sides of the political aisle.

Sen. Frank Sgambato of North Providence, D-Dist. 36, majority leader, led off the tributes, followed immediately by Sen. C. George DeStefano of Barrington, R-Dist. 44, minority leader, who said, "My party feels this loss very deeply."

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 11, 1967]

REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY

His name hardly was a household word. But here and among the advocates of such causes, Rep. John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island was the acknowledged champion of research in medicine.

One of his favorite causes was more Federal money for research into heart diseases. Nobody suspects he had any premonition in all the years he so avidly plugged for research funds, but just before he was to start his 13th term as a House member, Mr. Fogarty was found dead in his office—of a heart attack.

Mr. Fogarty pursued his projects with a will.

The Congressman had been honored by the American Cancer Society and he had received the Lasker Award for "extraordinary public service." He also had been a constant and leading pleader for extra funds for public education. In his own zealous way, he richly earned the honors which came his way.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Jan. 16, 1967]

TRIBUTES TO JOHN E. FOGARTY

In a period when many of our countrymen are concerned about the abilities and interest of our elected representatives who recommend and create legislation for the common good, John E. Fogarty stood as a monument of knowledge in his areas of concern. Eminent scientists, prominent physicians, skilled administrators and dedicated lay volunteer leaders of health and welfare programs always found in John E. Fogarty a colleague who was equally informed on every topic and who could accept and evaluate testimony based on a fantastic supply of background information which appeared to be at his very fingertips.

When a citizen left the presence of Mr. Fogarty he left with an increased respect for the capabilities of his elected representatives; he left with an increased belief that his own competence would be assayed by one with knowledge and experience rather than with indifference.

John E. Fogarty's business was the health and welfare of our people . . . and he knew his business . . . and while he lived, it flourished.

ROBERT N. MAZER,
Executive Secretary, National Dialysis Committee.

N. BELLMORE, N.Y.

May I, as one of Congressman John E. Fogarty's first and ardent admirers, pay tribute to this truly great man?

I remember him with his green bow tie as one who never forgot his beginnings and who often spoke publicly and proudly of his early days when he was a bricklayer. And I recall how much the late Dr. Ruggles and Archie Silverman loved him for his straightforwardness and honesty.

Yes, he received with embarrassment his very first citation on a solid silver platter tendered by me at a dinner given by the Providence Health Service, an organization started by Dr. Ruggles, and I believe the great guests in my house were instrumental in helping him to change his mind about trying to be governor of Rhode Island. He decided with us it would be better to be "a small fish in a big pond than a big fish in a small pond."

Yes, we will miss him; in fact the whole world will miss him! God bless his soul.

Mrs. ARCHIBALD SILVERMAN.

PROVIDENCE.

At a Democratic rally three months ago I was honored to be introduced to Congressman John E. Fogarty. I had admired this dedicated Congressman from afar for 12 years, so this was the thrill of a lifetime. He brought a touch of richness to my life that I will treasure deeply.

He was a dedicated leader to people from all walks of life. The State of Rhode Island has lost a loyal, sincere, honorable, dedicated leader with the passing of Congressman John E. Fogarty. He will never be forgotten by me.

ALICE E. D'ALESSIO.

PROVIDENCE.

I agree with the statement in your excellent editorial in the Providence Journal of January 11 that "it will be no easy task for the voters of his district to fill the seat John E. Fogarty filled with such distinction."

I knew him as an intelligent, capable, upright, kindly, fair and open-minded gentleman. I know from him and from what he did that his aim on this earth was to make his presence fruitful for good. He achieved it with excellence.

The honor and glory that came to Congressman Fogarty meant little to him. His main concern was in assisting others in whatever way he could regardless of race, color, religion, nationality or political persuasion. Any compensation he received was to him secondary. He held to his principles with courage whatever the political or other cost to himself. He was therefore a statesman in the truest sense of the word.

I share the sadness of his sister and brothers, Margaret, Bill, Ray, Frank and Charlie; his daughter Mary; and his wife Luise who I believe was of inestimable help to her husband and provided a great deal of the impetus that carried him to the position of high esteem in which he is held in the minds of the countless thousands of people who knew him.

JOSEPH A. MACKEY.

PROVIDENCE.

PRAYER DELIVERED BY REV. JOSEPH P. MCNAMARA, PASTOR OF ST. PHILIP'S CHURCH, GREENVILLE, R.I., AT THE BIER IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE STATE CAPITOL IN PROVIDENCE, R.I., JANUARY 12, 1967

May the angels take you into paradise: may the martyrs come to welcome you on your way, and lead you into the holy city, Jerusalem.

May the choir of angels welcome you, and with Lazarus who once was poor may you have everlasting rest.

I love the Lord because he has heard my voice in supplication, because he has inclined his ear to me the day I called.

The cords of death encompassed me; the snares of the nether world seized upon me; I fell into distress and sorrow.

And I called upon the name of the Lord, "O, Lord, save my life!"

Gracious is the Lord and just; yes, our God is merciful.

The Lord keeps the little ones; I was brought low and he saved me.

Return, O my soul, to your tranquility, for the Lord has been good to you.

For he has freed my soul from death, my eyes from tears, my feet from stumbling.

I shall walk before the Lord, in the lands of the living.

Eternal rest grant unto him O Lord. And let perpetual light shine upon him.

I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me, even if he die, shall live; and whoever lives and believes in me, shall never die.

Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, because he has visited and wrought redemption for his people, and has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of David his servant, as he promised through the mouths of his holy ones, the prophets from of old: salvation from our enemies and from the hands of all our foes.

He has fulfilled his kindness to our fathers, and been mindful of his holy covenant.

In the oath to Abraham our father, by which he swore to grant us, that, delivered from the hands of our enemies, we should serve him without fear.

In holiness and justice, before him all our days, and you, O child, shall be called the prophet of the Most High; for you shall go before the Lord to prepare his ways, to grant his people knowledge of salvation through forgiveness of their sins, because of the compassionate kindness of our God with which the Orient from on high will visit us, to shine on those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death to guide our feet into the way of peace.

Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord. And let perpetual light shine upon him.

I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me, even if he dies, shall live; and whoever lives and believes in me, shall never die.

Dearest brothers, let us faithfully and lovingly remember our brother whom God has taken to himself from the trials of this world.

Lord, have mercy.

Christ, have mercy.

Lord, have mercy.

Our Father who are in heaven hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us, and lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil.

From the gate of hell rescue his soul, O Lord. May he rest in peace. Amen.

O Lord, hear my prayer; and let my cry come to you. The Lord be with you—And with your spirit.

Let us pray. O Lord, we implore you to grant this mercy to your dead servant, that he who held fast to your will by his intentions, may not receive punishment in return for his deeds; so that, as the true faith united him with the throng of the faithful on earth, your mercy may unite him with the company of the choirs of angels in heaven. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord. And let perpetual light shine upon him. May he rest in peace. Amen.

May his soul and the souls of all the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace. Amen.

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 12, 1967]

REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY OF RHODE ISLAND DIES

JOHN E. FOGARTY (D-R.I.), 26-year veteran of the House and champion of national health bills, died unexpectedly Tuesday in his congressional office.

The 53-year-old chairman of the appropriations subcommittee handling labor and health, education and welfare funds, had gained a reputation for his work in bolstering health research.

FOGARTY was born in Providence, Mar. 23, 1913, and educated at La Salle Academy and Providence College. He apprenticed and worked as a brick mason in Harmony in his early years and rose to be president of Bricklayers Union 1 of Rhode Island.

Survivors include his wife, Luise (Rohland) Fogarty, and a daughter.

Funeral services will be held in the Roman Catholic Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul, Providence, probably on Saturday.

BRICKLAYER BECAME MEDICAL EXPERT

(By Herbert Black)

JOHN E. FOGARTY was a bricklayer who knew more about medical care than many doctors.

He was a Democratic Congressman from the smallest state, but for medical care, research and education he represented all the American people.

He was a fighting Irishman from Harmony, R.I., whose political trademark was a green bow tie. Yet he was gentle, modest and humorous. Highly intelligent, he educated himself so well that scientists, medical school deans and world-famed physicians were among his closest friends.

His untimely death Tuesday of a heart attack at 53 undoubtedly was due in part to his unceasing efforts for others. When he joined the House subcommittee in charge of health appropriations in 1949 the budget was $2 million for medical research. It now runs approximately $400 million.

His dedication to American health met a test in 1960 when Sen. Theodore Green retired and many urged FOGARTY to seek his seat. The congressman decided to keep his House seniority so he could continue as chairman of the subcommittee on health spending.

A typical question of FOGARTY's when health appropriations for the National Institutes of Health and for private research were placed in administration budgets was "Is it enough?"

He could never see spending billions to get to the moon if it meant slighting research in a disease that was killing children on earth.

Those who applied for funds often are startled at his ability to distinguish between important scientific projects and minor work and to differentiate between diseases which could wait and those that deserved funds fast.

FOGARTY began his intensive self-education in health when in 1947 he became a member of the subcommittee on health spending and was astounded to find America was not the healthiest nation in the world.

He was pleased when in 1960 the U.S. Public Health Service reported that five years had been added to the life expectancy of American baby boys born in 1940. They could expect to live to 66 instead of 61 because of medical progress.

An example of the way he took hold of a problem is his espousal of mental retardation aid. Speaking to a group of Rhode Island mothers in 1954, he was asked what the Federal government was doing about mental retardation. He said he didn't know, but would find out. He found out the government was doing virtually nothing. The next year a $750,000 research program was underway.

Federal spending for mental retardation now runs in the millions.

Many of FOGARTY's best friends are in the Boston area. Dr. Sidney Farber and Dr. Paul Dudley White attended him when he suffered a coronary attack in 1953. He watched his weight at their direction but worked as hard as ever for health funds.

The deans of Boston's medical schools praised his contributions to education and research and his interest in sick people everywhere.

Dean Robert H. Ebert of Harvard said "JOHN FOGARTY was one of the leading Congressional voices speaking out for the health needs of our generation. His untimely death is most tragic."

Dean William F. Maloney of Tufts commented "Rep. FOGARTY's death is a severe blow. The force of his conviction and his effort has been critical in protecting the health of the American people and in lengthening the expectation of useful life through Federally-financed research."

Dean Franklin G. Ebaugh Jr. of Boston University: "Cong. FOGARTY was one of the principal architects of what has turned out to be one of the most effective and far reaching medical research programs in the history of the world. The nation owes him an immense debt of gratitude."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] in the eloquent tribute which he has paid to a close associate, friend, and former colleague, one of the greatest men I have known in my lifetime and, certainly, one of the finest Members ever to serve in this House of Representatives. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness and a deep sense of personal grief and personal loss that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the life and service of JOHN E. FOGARTY.

If any man ever was a legend in his own time, JOHN FOGARTY was that man. All of us know the preeminence he achieved in the fields of public health and public welfare. We know, too, of his background as a bricklayer who never forgot the cause of the workingman.

As was said in the eloquent report of his death in the Washington Post of January 11:

> The gap between the modesty of his background and the breadth of his achievement was matched by a gap between the modesty of his self-appraisal and the praise that he received in life and death.

No man in the history of the Congress has done as much for public health as did JOHN FOGARTY. During his years in this House he worked constantly, tirelessly, and devotedly to rid us of the dread diseases that haunt mankind. The very last bill he reported to this House was one of major importance. The war on poverty and disease, he said, was a war that he was determined to escalate.

From almost his first day in Congress until his very last, JOHN FOGARTY carried on the fight for more funds for medical research, for mental retardation, and for the war on poverty. In the closing hours of the 89th Congress, in one of his last utterances on this floor, Representative FOGARTY made an impassioned plea for more funds for the war on poverty. In that statement he said:

> The war on poverty is a success, it is working, it is overcoming ancient enemies of man in thousands of local, grassroots encounters virtually every day of the year.

Mr. Speaker, the medical research program of this country is the greatest in the world. Our public health facilities are unequaled by any other nation. That these accomplishments have been attained is due in great measure to the effort and ability of the man whose memory we honor today.

Mr. Speaker, to Mrs. Fogarty and her daughter and his thousands of friends and constituents who literally adored him, Mrs. Albert and I extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, a colleague of mine, and a colleague on the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise here today to honor a man of the House. For the greater part of his prematurely short but amazingly productive life, JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY lived, breathed, and died as a Member of this great House of Representatives.

His death is an immeasurable loss to all of us who were his friends and colleagues in the House, but it is also a tremendous loss to the medical and scientific community and, most importantly,

to the millions of men, women, and children in all walks of life whom he served so nobly.

Dr. Howard Rusk, America's most distinguished leader in the field of vocational rehabilitation, captured the totality of the national loss in these words which he wrote in the New York Times of January 15:

If hospitals, research laboratories and institutes for the aged, infirm and retarded had flagpoles, every flag would have flown at half-staff this past week to mourn the loss of John E. Fogarty.

In a brief period of time, it is virtually impossible to summarize the many legislative accomplishments of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

He came to the House at the age of 27 in January 1941. After 6 years of service on the House Naval Affairs Committee—interrupted by a tour of duty as an enlisted man in the Navy during World War II—in 1947 he was assigned to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and the Federal Security Agency—later the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The chairman of the subcommittee at that time was one of the most distinguished figures in the House, Congressman Frank Keefe, of my own State of Wisconsin.

From the very beginning, the young Representative from Rhode Island worked closely with the chairman of the committee. In the very first year of his service on the committee, a new drug—streptomycin—was introduced on the market as an effective agent in the treatment of tuberculosis. However, this wonder drug was beyond the reach of everyone but the most wealthy—it cost $250 a gram. Frank Keefe and JOHN FOGARTY decided together, in true bipartisan fashion, that they would go beyond the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget and appropriate $3 million to try to find a way to manufacture this new drug synthetically. The Congress went along with the committee recommendation and, within a year, the cost of the drug was reduced to $10 a gram. Streptomycin was the first of a series of agents which, over the next 15 years, was to reduce the death rate from tuberculosis by an incredible 87 percent.

In 1949, when JOHN FOGARTY became chairman of the subcommittee, the discovery of the efficacy of cortisone against arthritis was first announced. Again he moved in to provide funds over the budget recommendation to reduce the prohibitive cost of this drug. The venture was successful, and thousands and thousands of sufferers from arthritis received blessed relief.

As a result of these experiences and of the testimony of scores of the Nation's most distinguished scientists whom he summoned before his committee, JOHN FOGARTY soon became the most eloquent advocate in the Halls of Congress on behalf of medical research. To the very end of his life, he was the most potent champion of the National Institutes of Health. Never satisfied with the status quo, he prodded both governmental and nongovernmental witnesses for new solutions to the age-old afflictions of mankind.

Statistics on the growth of the Institutes tell only part of the story. In the first year of his service on the subcommittee, the total budget of the National Institutes of Health was only a little in excess of $3 million. In the current year, the NIH budget approximates $1.4 billion.

In all of his endeavors, JOHN FOGARTY was always interested in the end result—in the number of lives saved and disabilities prevented. For example, in 1954, he became interested in a new diagnostic method for the detection of cancer of the cervix, one of the most common and deadly cancers in women. He pushed the Public Health Service hard on this, getting them to set up the first demonstration program in Memphis, Tenn. Since that time, the "Pap" smear has been administered to millions of women, and the mortality rate from cancer of the cervix has dropped sharply.

In the debates on the House floor on appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, he always marshaled the facts and figures to document the savings from relatively small investments in medical research. In 1956, in a rather heated debate on the value of the medical research expenditures of the National Institutes of Health, he ripped into those who contended that not enough progress was being made. Let me quote what he said then, for it evokes poignantly his deep compassion for suffering people and his continuing, restless search for new attacks upon disease:

I do not know how much we have expended on cancer research. I do not care. I do not know whether it is $100 million or $3 billion, but if any part of that was a help in finding this new technique in diagnosing cancer in a stage early enough to cure 100 percent of cancer of the cervix in women, every dime that we have expended has been well expended by the Congress of the United States.

Dr. Sidney Farber, of the Children's Hospital of Boston also appeared before our committee. He is an outstanding expert, not only in this country but in the world, in the field of leukemia which is cancer of the bloodstream, especially in children. He was the man who pioneered in the use of antifolic compounds in the treatment of leukemia. He has used these compounds to treat one boy since 1947. He discovered their use in Boston, with the help of funds from this appropriation, if you please. As a result of that discovery, for the first time in medical history a young boy afflicted with acute leukemia is still living after 10 years. How much is his life worth? I do not know, but to me it is worth every dime we have put into these programs over the past 10 years.

We also had testimony from people in the mental health field, like Dr. William C. Menninger, of the Menninger Institute in Topeka, Kansas, which is training more psychiatrists today than any other place in the world. He told us of the new advances that have been made in the drugs that have come out within the past 2 years, with the help of some of our appropriations. He told us, and Dr. Kline of New York State told us, that the discharges from mental institutions have increased 20 to 25 percent this past year because of the use of these new drugs. Ladies and gentlemen, I do not know what the cost has been for developing those new drugs, but if it is doing that, we are not spending enough, in my opinion, in that field.

How many people two years ago would have paid any attention to me if I said at that time that we had some information from some of our leading experts in the field of polio that there might be developed a vaccine that would prevent polio? But that has happened, because of the program put on by the National Foundation, and also supported by the National Institutes of Health for which the appropriations we are now discussing are made. That vaccine now is being given to children and has proved to be 70 to 80 percent effective. The goal is to make it 100 percent effective. As a result of that discovery, the heartaches of mothers and fathers and the suffering of children, not only in this country but all over the world, will be relieved. I do not know how much money it cost to develop that vaccine, and I do not care. It is worth every dime that we have spent.

Concluding that magnificent address, he expressed his profound disagreement with those who would move slowly against the major killers and cripplers of our time:

We are told sometimes that we must move at a measured pace—that a program of research to find the prevention and cure of disease must go along slowly.

I need not say to you that death and disability make their own pace and speed. They do not accommodate themselves to the tempo we set for research. They strike swiftly and relentlessly. Our vote today is to declare if we are willing to meet them on their own terms and show the way to better health for the people of this Nation of ours. Our vote today will indicate whether or not we really intend to help those who so desperately need assistance—the sick and the poor.

There are many who believe that JOHN FOGARTY's greatest contribution was in bringing the plight of the mentally retarded to national attention. With characteristic candor and honesty, he often related the fact that he was asked to address a group of parents of retarded children in his native city of Providence in the fall of 1954. He gave them a little talk, and then one of the parents asked him what the Federal Government was spending on this program. Congressman FOGARTY replied that he did not know, but that he would make it his business to find out during the next session of the Congress.

During the 1955 session, he probed Government officials as to what they were doing. He found that they were spending practically nothing on the problem of mental retardation—they viewed it as a hopeless affliction and testified that nothing much could be done about it. Mr. FOGARTY allowed as how something could be done about it. He persuaded our subcommittee and the Congress to vote the first appropriation for an attack on mental retardation—$750,000. This was eight years before President Kennedy's special message of February 1963, in which he called for a nationwide program to combat mental illness and mental retardation. That $750,000 in 1955 has grown to the point where, in the current year, our National Government is spending more than $300 million for various programs in the field of mental retardation.

This was the way JOHN FOGARTY operated. When he saw a need he worked skillfully, tirelessly, and effectively to try to meet it.

I recall another time when JOHN asked a young man he met why he needed canes to aid him walking. JOHN said later:

He told me he had multiple sclerosis. I had never heard of it, so I called up the Surgeon General. He told me that almost nothing was known about the disease and that

we were doing little to study it. So I got $500,000 as a starter to get to work on it.

Because of his restless, searching mind, he frequently proclaimed the necessity for legislation years before the rest of us in Congress and the country were aware of the need. For years he spoke in the Halls of the Congress and in many public forums, warning of the critical shortage of doctors and other health personnel. He introduced aid to medical education bills in a number of sessions of Congress before the final enactment of the Health Professions Assistance Act of 1963 vindicated his crusade.

He began talking of the medical, social, and economic problems of the elderly in the early 1950's. His persistent calls for a White House Conference on Aging finally reached fruition in 1961; the national awareness of the problems of the elderly stimulated by that Conference, culminated in the passage of his Older Americans Act of 1965, which established an Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

He was a constant champion of world health as an instrument of world peace, and he had the singular honor to be chosen seven times to be an official delegate to the annual assemblies of the World Health Organization. In 1958, he introduced a joint resolution in this House to set up a National Advisory Council on International Medical Research, and he did much to prepare the ground for the successful passage of the International Health Research Act of 1960.

He had a lifelong interest in rehabilitation. In recognition of his overall contributions to the field of rehabilitation, the National Rehabilitation Association in 1958 presented him with its coveted President's Award. The citation reads in part:

During the past ten years in his position as chairman of the subcommittee which controlled appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he has been a key figure in the developments which have brought substantial support for programs of rehabilitation and opened new doors for the handicapped throughout the nation.

In the 89th Congress alone, he sponsored the following pieces of legislation which became law:

A National Technical Institute for the Deaf;

Control of drug abuse;

Community Mental Health Centers Act amendments;

Community health service amendments;

Health research facilities amendments;

Water Pollution Control Act;

Medical complex centers for heart disease, cancer, and stroke;

Medical Library Assistance Act;

Health Professional Education Assistance Act;

Library Service Act amendments;

Model Secondary School for the Deaf Act; and the

Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

JOHN FOGARTY was awarded distinguished service citations by countless health and welfare organizations. In 1959, he received the national Albert Lasker Award for championing the advancement of medical research and public health. The $5,000 honorarium which accompanied the award was donated by Mr. FOGARTY to the Rhode Island Parents Council for Mentally Retarded Children—the same group which had stirred his interest in mental retardation in 1954. When JOHN was designated a winner of the Leadership Award by the Joseph P. Kennedy Jr. Foundation, given to the public official whose activities have awakened the public conscience or led to increased community effort on behalf of the mentally retarded, he donated the $8,000 honorarium to the John E. Fogarty Foundation, a charitable and educational organization which encourages medical research and fosters rehabilitation of the mentally retarded.

Four health and educational facilities have been dedicated in JOHN FOGARTY'S name in the State of Rhode Island: The John E. Fogarty Occupational Training Center for the Mentally Retarded, the John E. Fogarty Medical and Rehabilitation Unit at the Joseph H. Ladd School for the Mentally Retarded, the John E. Fogarty Health Science Building at the University of Rhode Island Colleges of Pharmacy and Nursing, and the John E. Fogarty School in Foster, R.I.

On February 3, 1966, President Johnson presented JOHN with the American Heart Association 1966 Heart of the Year Award.

His other awards and honors are too numerous to list here—honorary degrees from universities in many parts of the land, and honorary fellowships in a number of the Nation's most distinguished medical and health organizations.

But all of the honors and the awards and the legislative accomplishments do not create the full picture of the magnificent human being he was.

He had a been a bricklayer for 10 long and hard years before he came to the Congress and he was proud of it. He did not receive a great deal of formal education, but no one was more avid in pursuit of knowledge. If he did not understand the complicated medical terminology of a medical witness, he would say to him simply, kindly, and firmly: "Doctor, you will just have to state that again so that all of us can understand it. After all, I have to go up on the floor of the House in a few weeks and defend your request, so I would like you to put it in language that we can all understand."

He did not follow the stereotype of the combative Irishman. In his convictions he was persistent—yes, even stubborn—but he rarely raised his voice. His technique in interrogating a witness was never to bully him, but to quietly lead him down a trail of seemingly innocuous questions whose end only JOHN could foresee.

I have spent more time with JOHN FOGARTY than with any other man in public life. I served with him on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee for 10 years. As chairman and ranking minority member, we worked closely together. During this decade we spent many hundreds of hours in hearings, formal committee meetings, and informal conferences. We have spent many weeks together on official inspection trips and we attended two of the World Health Organization's annual meetings together. We have been to many social functions together. My wife and I have had the pleasure of spending many pleasant hours with JOHN and his wife, Luise. So when I speak of JOHN FOGARTY I am speaking of a man whom I not only loved and admired as much as any man I have ever known, but I am also speaking of a man I knew as well as any man on this earth.

JOHN FOGARTY was a great American, a great humanitarian, and a great legislator. As such he will live in history. As such he will always live in my mind. But I will remember him first in terms of what he was in his day-to-day relationships with his fellow man—his great personality—his fierce dedication to any goal he set for himself; his contempt for anything less than complete truth and candor in anyone, including himself; the great pride he had in his family which he so seldom made evident in words but was so obvious to those who knew him well; his complete loyalty to close friends; his equally complete trust in those friends; his almost unlimited energy, and the way he drove himself to use it to the utmost.

And I will remember him for many little things—his love of brick; his almost insatiable appetite for good steaks, and how he liked to broil them in the brick fireplace of his brick-floored basement with potatoes cooked in the hot ashes; how he loved to get a group of friends together for a few drinks, and listen to Judge Mackey play the piano and sing the simple, witty songs he composed; how hard it was for anyone but John to get the check at a restaurant; his great pride in anything Irish; his robust handshake; how much he enjoyed a good joke, and his strange self-consciousness on the infrequent occasions when he would tell one himself; his dislike of the pretentious to the point of sometimes being the only one in a business suit at the head table; the green bow tie that became almost an emblem or coat of arms; how he would often take off his shoes during our committee hearings; his calm unhurried approach to things—even to the point of missing his plane on several occasions; the steady direct way he looked into everyone's eyes when he talked to them. Then too, I could never forget his great sympathy for anyone, especially children and old people, with a mental or physical disability; his love of God and faith in the Catholic religion that was simple and pure, and completely free from ostentation.

All of these things about JOHN will live in the minds of those of us who were his close personal friends so long as we are on this earth. JOHN FOGARTY was a great man for his tangible accomplishments, he was a wonderful friend, but he was also simple and humble—there was nothing artificial about this man.

In the many years I have been privileged to be his friend and colleague, I never ceased to marvel at the growth and maturity which he eventually achieved.

Who has said it better than Shakespeare: "What a piece of work is a man."

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the beautiful tributes that have been paid to our late colleague by his distinguished coworker from the great State of Rhode Island, by the minority whip and the distinguished Republican leader, his colleague on the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

As some of us were leaving the cathedral in Providence, R.I., on Friday last, where a great crowd had gathered and had packed every pew and every corner of that very large edifice, and where were gathered the high and the low, the rich and the poor, leaders and those who were led, for the beautiful services and tributes to our late colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], said to me that the most surprised person of all would have been JOHN FOGARTY at his own funeral.

As a matter of fact, the crowd was not limited to the cathedral. On all sides of the streets, as the sad procession went from the church to the cemetery, again, as our colleague has described, there were so many people gathered.

The remark of the gentleman from Texas was so appropriate, because of all the characteristics of JOHN FOGARTY, the ones I believe that brought out so many people in reverence and in devotion were his humility, his dislike—as has been said—of display, of ostentation, his modesty, his reluctance to claim credit for the monumental contribution which he made to health, education, and the welfare of the ordinary citizens of this great country.

So, Mr. Speaker, it was a tribute well and adequately earned and deserved.

I was saddened of course to be there. I join with all of us in saying to us, and to the Nation that we have lost indeed one of the giants of this body

He had a devoted wife, Luise, and a lovely daughter Mary, who has so many friends here where she attends Trinity College. To them and to all members of his family, Mrs. Boggs joins with me in expressions of love and sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, our Lord Jesus said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." These words exemplify the character and the spirit of our colleague, JOHN FOGARTY. He gave of his energy and talent for the good of all of us—of all the American people. His accomplishments in improving the health of our people are legend. For our good health and our extended lifespan we are in his debt, as we are for his good works to improve education in our country.

Mr. Speaker, in his second epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul said:

> He that soweth little shall reap little; and he that soweth plenteously shall reap plenteously. Let every man do according as he is disposed in his heart, not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver.

JOHN FOGARTY was a cheerful giver, and his devotion to this House and to his State and to our Nation earned for him the gratitude of his country.

When JOHN FOGARTY entered this House in 1941, our National Government's investment in medical research was about $3 million. Through his tireless efforts and his foresight, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, this investment today exceeds $1 billion. Today the budget of the U.S. Public Health Service alone is $2.5 billion—40 times greater than it was 20 years ago—and more than $1 billion of this sum is expended for medical research. JOHN FOGARTY played a tremendous role in making this extensive research possible for the benefit of the American people.

"Mr. Public Health" is a most appropriate title for our departed colleague, who believed firmly that "no American life should be lost because of a lack of research funds"—and he expended all of his energy and devotion to assure that our health would be ever better and our lives lengthened.

The 20 years from 1944 to 1964 have seen extensive improvements in our Nation's health by virtue of the increased investment in medical research by our National Government. JOHN FOGARTY was a chief architect in these improvements which include in this period:

First. A decline from 41 deaths to 4 deaths out of every 100,000 people from tuberculosis;

Second. A decline by two and a half times the number of deaths from rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease;

Third. A drop of 50 percent in the number of deaths from pneumonia and influenza;

Fourth. An almost total elimination in deaths of polio in this period; and

Fifth. A decline of 85 percent in the maternity death rate, and of 38 percent in the infant death rate.

These are but a few of the milestones of progress which have been made in the past two decades, and JOHN FOGARTY has been a leader in these achievements.

There is much more that I could add to the list of JOHN FOGARTY's good works to improve the health and the education of our people. I cannot close without remarking on the beautiful tribute paid to him last Friday by the people of Providence who came, young, old, rich, and poor, to pay their last respects to a great man—to their Representative, to a native son of Rhode Island. I had the distinct honor to be a Member of the delegation from this House to attend the requiem mass for our colleague, and it was a most moving and beautiful tribute to him. On the way to the great cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul, the streets were lined with the citizens of Providence who came to salute our departed colleague for the last time. I join with them in this final salute, and I say for all of us that we shall miss him dearly, as will the people of this great Nation.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it was my sad privilege and honor to be present in Rhode Island last Friday and witness the great tribute which was paid to our late friend.

When I think of JOHN FOGARTY, I think of Ralph Waldo Emerson, who said that "America is but another name for opportunity." JOHN FOGARTY took maximum advantage of his opportunity to be of maximum service to mankind. He came from the smallest State in the Union, but he was the biggest man in the House of Representatives for many years in the important field of his major interest.

I do not recall having seen upon a similar occasion such a spontaneous outpouring of love and appreciation as I witnessed upon the occasion of the funeral services for this good man. To see those people lined up block after block and mile after mile, standing in reverence, was a stimulating thing. It was a great tribute to the mind and heart and spirit of JOHN FOGARTY.

But, as pointed out by others here today, JOHN FOGARTY was not only beloved in New England. He was beloved in this House in a very special and wonderful way. We cannot add to his year-by-year service. It need not be added to. This is but a time for praise of the memory of the man who made this record. His contribution was not just to New England; not just to the Nation, but to all mankind.

I am privileged to stand on the floor of the House in the presence of my colleagues, and with thoughts of his wonderful family—whom he adored and for whom we express every sympathy—and pay tribute to the memory and good work of a man who always stood tall in any company and who will long be remembered for his contribution to the Nation's good.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I thank the distinguished chairman.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the service of our late friend, JOHN FOGARTY, in this Chamber will always live in the annals of the legislative history of the Congress and in the annals, more broadly, of the history of our country.

JOHN FOGARTY was one of the most dedicated men who ever served in the Congress of the United States. He was a man whose service was right across the board on all legislation, but he specialized, as time passed after he came here as a new Member, in a field which is of utmost importance to every person alive.

He served the sick, the poor, the afflicted, the underprivileged not only in America but throughout the world. His service to the sick and the afflicted will always be remembered as decades and generations pass.

After death usually one is forgotten quickly, but not so in the case of JOHN FOGARTY. His imprint on the minds and

hearts of Americans and the benefits which will flow to human beings not only in America but elsewhere throughout the world will be remembered for generations to come.

I can remember, not so many years ago, when we had a hard fight trying to get $3 million appropriated for medical research. My good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] brought back also the memory of another great man, Frank Keefe. Frank Keefe was the ranking member of the subcommittee on which JOHN FOGARTY was chairman. I can see them both now in the well of the House, bulwarks of strength in making progress in an important field. I am very glad my friend from Wisconsin referred also to Frank Keefe, because JOHN FOGARTY and Frank Keefe were a team, a scene beautiful to witness. Both were great Americans, both were great legislators, of opposite parties, but both having that beautiful outlook on life of serving people who were sick and afflicted.

One could talk unlimitedly about JOHN FOGARTY and the leadership that he has given to the people of our country and to mankind in general, but my colleagues have already referred in more detail than I believe is necessary for me on this occasion.

Another aspect of JOHN FOGARTY which endeared him to us and made him a symbol for others to follow was his understanding mind, his broad outlook on life, his nobility of character.

So today we are grieved as we pay eulogies. We were grieved when we heard of his death. And he died in the line of duty, in his office in the Capitol.

So today we say we are grieved, but mankind—you and I, as legislators, and others—can learn lessons from the life of JOHN FOGARTY which will enable us to more effectively serve the people of our country and to carry out the great work he led in laying the foundation and making great progress. You and I can learn from what JOHN FOGARTY did and improve upon it, advance upon his work, continuing the very strong bases that JOHN FOGARTY laid for the benefit of mankind.

So, I join with my friend from Rhode Island and my other colleagues in expressing my deep sorrow at the passing of our dear friend and in extending to Mrs. Fogarty and her loved ones my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. The passing of JOHN FOGARTY left not only sorrow in the House of Representatives but all over the United States. As Dr. Howard Russell said in his article in last Sunday's New York Times:

> No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities, and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

JOHN FOGARTY, through his ceaseless efforts and dedication, was responsible more than any other man, for the great progress which has been made in the field of health in the last 25 years. He was the Nation's leader in the field of health and truly had become "Mr. Public Health."

Many great men, such as Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, made great contributions to health, education, and welfare of our country. However, it was through the vision and courage of JOHN FOGARTY that this Nation grew up and came of age in its fight against disease.

Unfortunately, one must overcome much opposition and many obstacles to successfully promote programs that benefit mankind. I recall that it took Theodore Roosevelt 2 years just to put through Congress a law requiring meat inspection in our packing plants after it was discovered that our soldiers in the Spanish-American War were dying from eating poisoned canned corned beef. It is a great tribute to JOHN FOGARTY that despite the apathy that was often present he accomplished so much in such a short span of time in the fields of health, mental retardation, vocational rehabilitation, and aid to the aged. We can all recall many, many days when he went down into the well of this House and through his great leadership gained approval of appropriation bills carrying many, many millions of dollars in addition to the budget requests in order that essential medical facilities and research could be expanded. This Nation has benefited immeasurably and will continue to benefit in the years ahead because of his leadership.

As most of you know, in his passing I have lost a very close, personal friend.

Since the first day he came to the Congress, 26 years ago, we had a close and personal friendship, that had the opportunity to grow with the years.

JOHN's office in the House of Representatives, when he first came to Congress, was next to mine. We walked back and forth to the House floor together. During the sessions of Congress, we both stayed at the University Club. Many mornings we met in the lobby, walked to St. Patrick's Church for a short prayer, then on to the Capitol.

We had the time and privilege of discussing with one another our youth problems and the many experiences that had intervened through the years. We had many things in common. My span of life has been far greater, but JOHN FOGARTY had lived a full and fruitful one.

JOHN loved his wife Luise and daughter Mary very deeply. They were his whole life. His daughter, Mary, a student at Trinity College, had the pleasure of his company at least 1 night a week for dinner. She brought her close friends to meet her dad. He was proud of her achievements and progress.

As a man and legislator, JOHN FOGARTY presented a model of our best manhood. He was industrious, sincere, and understanding. He was painstaking and courageous. Not many men had a life more remarkable or attained dignity and honor more striking.

JOHN FOGARTY was awarded numerous college degrees and honorable citations because of his great abilities—his splendid accomplishments and the heroic virtue and manliness of his character. He never hesitated to say or do what he thought should be said or done.

JOHN FOGARTY was a deeply religious man and believed that religion was for everyday use in all of the duties of life. In his private life and in his public acts and utterances he exhibited the virtues of the Christian as conspicuously as he displayed those of the great statesman and patriot that he was.

The people of this great country, and other lands, honored and respected JOHN FOGARTY. American history will, I am sure, as was apparent by the many thousands who passed his bier and thronged the cathedral, find it difficult to furnish few parallels to his useful and exalted record of helpfulness and concern for his fellowman.

I join my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Fogarty and daughter, Mary, in these sad and troubled hours.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in this tribute to our colleague and my beloved friend JOHN E. FOGARTY.

I was privileged to be a part of the official congressional delegation at his funeral.

In the years that I have been in public life and in all the funeral rites that I have attended, I have never witnessed or been a part of, a more magnificent tribute than that paid to JOHN FOGARTY on last Friday morning. From every walk of life—the high and the mighty—the ordinary and the disadvantaged—white and black, the young and the old—varying creeds and beliefs—from the fields of religion, medicine, press, public life, education, health, labor, finance and business—from the whole spectrum of American life, they came—they came, to pay their last full measure of devotion, to one of the most extraordinary men who ever served his State or his Nation.

Reference has been made here today and the RECORD will detail the outstanding service that JOHN FOGARTY gave to mankind during his 26 years as a Member of this body. That service resulted in the granting of more degrees, honors, awards, and citations to Congressman FOGARTY, than have ever been conferred on any Member of Congress in its history.

Reams of editorials and articles have been written of his work as a Member of this House. They, too, will be a part of this RECORD. And they will eloquently prove that great public service and personal sacrifice does not go unnoticed and unheralded.

Great eulogies will and have flowed from his passing from our midst. But none so moving and touching—none so human as that delivered at the funeral mass by Rev. Joseph L. Lennon, O.P., dean of Providence College. I am pleased that our colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] has made this eulogy part of this RECORD.

When one understood the nature and the personality of JOHN FOGARTY one

quickly grasped why he interested himself in the problems of all human beings. It really was a simple philosophy that motivated him. He wanted to lift the burdens of disease, pestilence, and ignorance from the backs of his fellow men. And he greatly succeeded because of his skill, his perseverance, and patience. His was an all-consuming, constant concern. When others would have rested on their laurels and laid down their oars, he persisted and continued for he realized that man's work in the fields of education, health, welfare, and labor is never done.

Over the Speaker's rostrum, high in this great Hall is a chiseled inscription of Daniel Webster that is one of the hallmarks of service in the Congress:

> Let us develop the resources of our land—call forth its powers—build up its institutions—promote all its great interests—and see whether we also, in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY in his day and generation performed something worthy to be remembered today and forever.

What consolation must come to his devoted wife, Luise, and his loving daughter, Mary, as they ponder his life and his works. Their deep and heavy grief is softened by the remarkable legacy he left.

His brothers and his sister are comforted in the well-documented knowledge that his was a useful and productive life.

His staff in his Washington office, George Kelley and Grace Beirne, and his Providence offices and his chief committee staff member for 14 years, Bob Moyer, can swell with pride, that they were all a part of his works and his service.

The State of Rhode Island and his district have been honored by his service and history will record that he brought to both distinction and honor.

The people and the institutions of the Nation, itself, will long remember and never forget what JOHN E. FOGARTY meant to a better, safer, healthier, more educated America.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I know that I can very safely say that each and every Member of this body was deeply shocked and saddened to learn of the sudden passing of the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, just a few short hours before he was to be sworn in for his 14th term here in the House of Representatives. Those of us who were fortunate enough to be numbered among his many friends have sustained a loss that is hard even now to translate into words.

JOHN FOGARTY was a superb human being. He was a warm, feeling, and hard-working man who spent most of his adult life caring about others. I do not think it necessary to point out what JOHN FOGARTY has meant to the great programs our Federal Government has launched to improve both the physical and mental health of all our citizens. Rhode Island may have elected JOHN FOGARTY to this House but it did not have exclusive right to him. His work in the health field made him everybody's Congressman.

I knew JOHN FOGARTY since first coming to the House of Representatives almost a quarter of a century ago and out of that knowledge grew a deep and abiding friendship. I have, a number of times, traveled abroad with him meeting, among others, His Holiness Pope Pius XII and Presidents de Valera and O'Kelly, of Eire. JOHN FOGARTY before spiritual and secular heads of state was, however, no different than the JOHN FOGARTY who sat here in this House. His fine, human character was much too ingrained, too strong to change. And indeed if it did, what could it change to? Certainly it could not improve.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN FOGARTY will be sorely missed by the House of Representatives and by all of us who knew him. There is no replacement for a man like JOHN FOGARTY. To his lovely widow, Luise, and his daughter, Mary, his brothers and his sister, I extend my deepest sympathy and prayers in their hour of bereavement.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] and others in paying a tribute to our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, who passed away on the eve of the convening of this, the 90th Congress.

I was shocked and saddened by the news of his passing and the realization that our colleague would not be with us again. JOHN FOGARTY served 26 years in the House of Representatives. He served ably and well and with great distinction.

It has been my pleasure to serve with him for a score of years as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He served with effectiveness as a member of this committee and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations, where programs that dealt with human needs were funded. His contribution to the advancement of education and to research in the improvement of health will be his greatest monument.

JOHN FOGARTY was a great man—a compassionate man. He loved the Congress—he loved the House of Representatives. He was dedicated to the people of his district, of his beloved State of Rhode Island, and to this great Nation.

It was my privilege to serve with JOHN FOGARTY as a member of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations. I sat at his side and we worked together. He was my good friend.

JOHN FOGARTY was able. He was forceful—he was capable—and he was effective. He was faithful in the discharge of his duties and responsibilities.

We shall all miss him. I extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Fogarty and to other members of the family in their bereavement.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I share the deep sorrow felt by Members of Congress by the sudden loss of JOHN E. FOGARTY, one of our most able and highly respected colleagues. He shall be sorely missed, but the results of his zealous efforts and accomplishments during his tenure of office will live on and will serve to benefit all of us and a vast number of Americans across the country.

I served under JOHN FOGARTY's chairmanship of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and am personally and keenly aware of his deep and sincere interest in the health, education, and well-being of his fellow man. The great honors bestowed upon him for the efforts he put forth to further research in medicine are richly deserved.

JOHN E. FOGARTY's funeral in Providence, R.I., was the largest and most impressive tribute I have ever witnessed. It was so apparent that hundreds of people of all walks of life were greatly saddened by their great loss and truly appreciative of JOHN FOGARTY's contribution to his district, State, and Nation. His long and distinguished career in the U.S. House of Representatives will be an inspiration to those of us who served with him, and his leadership in the fields of health, education, and welfare will live on for years and years in this great Nation he loved so much.

To Mrs. Fogarty and his daughter and the family, we express our deepest sympathy and condolences.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MARSH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I recall when slightly over a week ago the gentleman from Rhode Island took the well to perform a duty that only he could perform, and that was to bring to the attention of the House the unfinished business for that day. He announced the sad passing of this late and beloved Member of the House of Representatives, JOHN FOGARTY. It was after the state of the Union message, and at this critical moment in our Nation's history, the House of Representatives did not forget.

It recalls the words of Kipling:

> The tumult and the shouting dies—
> The Captains and the Kings depart—
> Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
> An humble and a contrite heart.
> Lord God of Hosts be with us yet,
> Lest we forget—lest we forget!

Mr. Speaker, the House will not forget this man. America will not forget this man. Mankind will not forget this man, and his family will not forget this man—this man with a humble and a contrite heart.

I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for yielding.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed friend, the late JOHN E. FOGARTY, who so ably represented the people of Rhode Island in the U.S. Congress for 26 years.

His native State has lost a distinguished son and dedicated servant. The Congress has lost one of its most effective legislators. The people of the United States have lost their greatest champion in the field of public health. No one outside the medical profession and the broad field of science has done as much for health and medical research as JOHN E. FOGARTY did in his lifetime.

It was never my privilege to serve with him on a committee, but all of us know how competent he was in his work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. He richly deserved the title of "Mr. Public Health."

Mrs. Haley joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to his wife and daughter.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, as one of the junior Members of the House of Representatives, I would like to add my words of respect for our late colleague, JOHN FOGARTY.

The description of the funeral in Providence, R.I., and of the tribute paid to JOHN FOGARTY has been amply given here. But JOHN FOGARTY is also remembered in Buffalo, in my district, and I am sure in many other parts of the United States.

JOHN FOGARTY is remembered for many things, but for one thing in particular, which I would just like to cite for the RECORD. During the 89th Congress when the immigration bill was before this body, JOHN FOGARTY had an amendment which he asked me to speak in behalf of because I was from a border district, on the border with Canada. When he explained his amendment to me, it seemed incredible that in this day and age that any two nations would have laws prohibiting retarded children from crossing an international boundary.

Prior to JOHN FOGARTY's amendment, if an American child was retarded and crossed over the Peace Bridge into Canada and was noticeably mongoloid or had visible evidences of retardation, that child was turned back and sent back to the United States. And the process was reversed if a Canadian child who was retarded came over the Peace Bridge into the United States and was observed by a U.S. immigration inspector to be retarded, then that child was ordered with his parents back into Canada.

JOHN FOGARTY perceived this inhumane law and wrote an amendment into the Immigration Act and spoke in its behalf as did several others of us and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] accepted the amendment. Today, thanks to JOHN FOGARTY this inhumane practice no longer exists.

Mr. Speaker, when JOHN FOGARTY died there was great grief among many, many people, particularly the parents of retarded children and there was great grief in the Buffalo area on the Niagara Frontier. His memory will be enshrined not only in Providence and in Washington, but certainly in Buffalo, N.Y., and many other parts of the world where his efforts were so productive in helping mankind.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to identify myself with the fine tributes that have already been paid to our late friend.

I came to the Congress shortly after JOHN FOGARTY. It was my privilege to have an early and lasting friendship with JOHN.

Many statements have been made with regard to his work in health, education, and welfare and they are certainly true, but JOHN FOGARTY demonstrated that he was interested in the whole country and in all of its population. Less notice has been taken of his work in the field of public works, but JOHN FOGARTY left a mark in his efforts in that field that will always stand as a monument to his efforts in looking after each segment of these United States.

Possessed of real ability, JOHN FOGARTY was also possessed of courage. He made up his own mind and once he made it up, he was not to be swayed by personal or other pressures.

I say here that of all the men I have known in Congress, I have not known one who was more effective when he took the well of the House than JOHN FOGARTY, because the Members believed that he believed what he said. I know of no man who was more able in convincing his colleagues, and while JOHN is gone and we shall all miss him and extend our deepest sympathy to his family, the works of JOHN FOGARTY in this Congress will stand as long as there is a United States.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to express the sadness that I feel on the passing of JOHN FOGARTY.

All of us know that we have lost a noble American in the death of our beloved colleague, JOHN FOGARTY, of the State of Rhode Island.

Rhode Island is a small State. JOHN FOGARTY was a very big man. He was big in the expansiveness of his personality. He was big in perception and in sensitivity to human problems. He was big in his compassion for his fellow human beings.

Some men walk through life and leave not one heel print upon the pavements of time. JOHN FOGARTY left an imprint that will live forever in his works—his efforts to improve and accelerate medical research so that men might more successfully withstand bodily ills and failings. He was a champion of our senior citizens, and it was largely through his efforts that an Administration of Aging has been established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It was perhaps prophetic that President Johnson last year presented Mr. FOGARTY with the American Heart Association's 1966 Heart of the Year Award. Mr. FOGARTY's heart now has failed him, but he will continue to be the heartbeat behind much of the medical research being performed in this Nation of ours today.

I knew JOHN FOGARTY well. I served with him on the House Committee on Appropriations for a number of years. We were good friends. I had great respect for his ability, his conscientiousness and his achievements. I know that not only will JOHN FOGARTY's memory live on in Rhode Island through health and education facilities named in his honor, but also in this House of Representatives where he served so vigorously and so well.

The Nation has been deprived of a dedicated and inspired spokesman, and I join with the gentleman from Rhode Island and the others in paying tribute to him and in expressing my condolences to his family.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, "See everything, overlook a lot, improve a little." This admonition "see everything, overlook a lot, improve a little" have been words of comfort to his bereaved wife, Luise, and his dear daughter, Mary, in the days since our beloved colleague, my close friend, JOHN FOGARTY went to his eternal reward.

This call to "see everything" and then seek change with charity are attributed to Pope John XXIII. Properly they apply as a common characteristic not only to the great and simple pontiff but also to two other men named John who followed in his way and his will, President John F. Kennedy and Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY.

To lose Pope John is tragic, to lose John Kennedy is grievous. To lose JOHN FOGARTY is something I find unbearable.

Therefore, because we cannot in our frail nature endure such tragic grievous unbearable loss, we must not lose them and they must not be lost to us.

Let us seek instead to find in these lives what is good and great and therefore undying and eternal.

I choose to link these three men called John who have gone before us not just because I have had the privilege of meeting and knowing all three—John my Pope, John my President, and JOHN, my friend. Rather I contemplate them in

common because I know the deep feeling my friend, JOHN FOGARTY, had for his President, John F. Kennedy, and his country and his Pope and his church.

Look at their lives and find that chord which says death is victory, time is nothing, hope is lasting. Find that chord and we have gained far more than our immediate loss.

It is our good fortune that the legacy of these lives, the legacy of JOHN FOGARTY of which we speak today is plainly and frankly before us. In his memory as I knew him it is more becoming that we speak plainly and frankly about him. He made plain talk the highest eloquence and frankness the best of language.

Speaking honestly about JOHN FOGARTY will do him honor enough.

In all honesty, in the history of the Congress and the country there was never a man who was more effectively devoted to the commonweal and uncommon ideal in health and education, and the dignity of the human person.

In the field of health his record needs no address here—it is well inscribed on the statutes of this Nation and it is clearly stated in the words of Dr. Howard Rusk, the greatest humanitarian in the American medical world today, who wrote on January 15:

> No one in the history of the Country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

We know that when Dr. Rusk cites the record in health which JOHN FOGARTY wrote he is mindful of the pioneering Fogarty programs which he wrote with our distinguished colleague, Senator HILL in the Senate and our distinguished colleague in this body, MEL LAIRD, in mental retardation, mental health, dental care, allied services, and the great health institutes and libraries of medicine which helped to bring about a new era in medical education.

In speaking of JOHN FOGARTY as "Mr. Public Health" let us not slight his great contribution in other fields so vital to the dignity of the human person.

Speaking frankly, again as he would have us speak, JOHN FOGARTY'S formal education was limited in years but sound and thorough. The classic schooling he received from the Christian Brothers in LaSalle Academy awakened in him an intense desire to know—yes, to see—everything.

Though time and means did not permit further education this desire to know, and love of knowledge, enabled him to communicate and converse on equal terms with leaders throughout the world of science, letters, the arts and the humanities, and the law itself.

Money, and in truth all material and created things as distinguished from persons, meant little to him. They had value only as tools to help people.

Yet, for want of a better measurement, it must be cited that under his guidance and chairmanship the Federal appropriation for education rose from less than $1 billion to nearly $9 billion in the last 10 years.

His consecration was to quality education and freedom in the search for truth and knowledge. Nineteen major universities had conferred doctorates upon him.

Let us not forget his love of the poor. In their cause he would tolerate no waste of the resources allocated to their benefit. He wanted the best in Headstart. He demanded clear signs of community progress. He saw to it that the aging and the elderly were not slighted but given the status in dignity that their years and their contributions to America deserved.

The listing of laws written and honors won and deeds achieved by JOHN FOGARTY is a record of magnitude. But this alone will not best serve the memory of our friend because he wore his laurels lightly. He looked upon honors not as personal recognition. Rather he accepted them as aid and support for the causes for which he fought so well.

Now it is for us to enlist in all the great works he has so nobly begun and make his goals our goals. God grant that we may be equal to these tasks as he was more than equal to any challenge he faced.

It will help us and those who will follow us to here examine those personal qualities of JOHN FOGARTY which enabled him so well to see everything, overlook a lot, and improve a little until the little improvements become great and living monuments.

See him as his friends saw him. And what Irishman, what good Democrat, what sick or poor or elderly or man of good will was not his friend?

We see a gifted man, possessing courage, stubborn determination, and insensitivity to pain or trial. To him a challenge was a sport, a problem to be solved. To JOHN there was no such thing as the impossible.

He wanted to give others the tools they needed to defeat the obstacles he had met and defeated, even death itself, because he had encountered mortality and overcome mortality.

Fourteen years ago he looked death in the eye and stared it down. It never did claim him and it never will. Rather, in compliance with the will of God and in the love of God he built his causeway to eternity brick by brick and no one will ever tear it down.

Having conquered death himself he refused to believe that anything was incurable.

I recall traveling in Ireland and visiting Dublin a month after JOHN FOGARTY had made one of his good will tours to the land of his ancestors. After his family and his church and his country, Ireland was his great love. I heard from our late Ambassador this account of an episode which took place in his residence.

JOHN had met a very wealthy man and characteristically told him to give away some of his money for the mentally retarded. The man replied that he never gave money for incurables—just for those with hope.

JOHN FOGARTY thundered there was no such thing as an incurable and for good measure insulted the man so he would never forget it. He saved his insults and used them well—always to rout despair or deceit or malice or stupidity.

In my frankness you see I have finally come upon a fault in JOHN FOGARTY.

He carried a chip on his shoulder that was more than a chip. It was a hod full of bricks, for he was and never forgot, and would never let his friends and enemies forget, he was a bricklayer.

Whenever he met a lack of charity or prejudice or dishonesty or pompousness he hit it with a ton of bricks—made of the clay of faith and hope and charity.

As a bricklayer, he never forgot his spirit level and he used it to constantly remind himself and us that the only real equality is not all on a level of status quo but always a higher course of excellence.

Now is the time for final tributes until we meet again and may pay him tribute, each in his own way.

For the first time in history a President, Lyndon B. Johnson, paused at the beginning of his address on the state of the Union to express his sympathy to the Congress on our loss of a beloved colleague.

In this body we pay tribute and sympathy, for on one side we have lost our most potent proponent and on the other side you have lost a most constructive and worthy adversary.

The people of his State know this loss. I watched them all along the way from statehouse to church and on to the cemetery. I saw the rich and poor weep alike, the old and young join in sorrow. And I heard one laboring man say:

> He was the greatest we ever had in the State of Rhode Island and who was Rhode anyway? We should name it the State of Fogarty.

For his lovely wife, Luise, and his dear daughter, Mary, there is an estate of Fogarty. It rests on a verdant and tree grown hill in Harmony, R.I., the home he built so well and truly loved. May the memory of the man from Harmony, so well enshrined there in books and mementos of the world's respect be ever green and ever blessed.

St. Thomas More, the martyred chancellor of England, refused to bow to the will of a tyrant king and went to his death to live in the history of the law as "A man for all seasons."

Our beloved colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY, would never deign to bow his head to the tyrannies of disease, illness, ignorance, and indifference wherever and whenever these tyrannies were visited upon his fellow human beings anywhere in the world.

Because he would not suffer these tyrannies and instead, labored to better the life of all men, as Thomas More is a "man for all seasons," JOHN E. FOGARTY is a "man for all persons." That is the true estate and legacy of JOHN FOGARTY—courage, charity, and above all, courage.

The verse of an Irish poet, Thomas Moore, speaks our mood, in closing:

> Oh! thus shall we mourn, and his memory's light,
> While it shines through our hearts, will improve them,
> For worth shall look fairer, and truth more bright,
> When we think how he lived but to love them!

(Sir THOMAS MORE, "It Is Not the Tear at This Moment Shed.")

Mr. Speaker, no aspect of health affairs in this country was overlooked or neglected by JOHN FOGARTY.

Among his many other interests was a concern for dental health and he vig-

orously supported many programs designed to expand dental research and extend the availability of dental care. His efforts in this regard were recognized and demonstrably appreciated by the organized dental profession.

He was an honorary member of the American Dental Association, the Rhode Island Dental Association, and many other dental organizations throughout the country.

The February 1967 issue of the Journal of the American Dental Association will carry an article and an editorial paying tribute to JOHN FOGARTY. I would like to include them at the conclusion of my remarks. They are as follows:

[Editorial, Journal of the American Dental Association, February 1967]

JOHN E. FOGARTY, 1913–67

John Fogarty is dead. Were the man himself to write this notice, that is how he would state it: John Fogarty is dead. He would put it that simply, that bluntly, that stripped of frills and pomp.

There was, in John Fogarty, a congruence between what he felt and what he did that is rare in any man and is especially so in a political figure of national significance.

National politics is a complex endeavor of melding a whole range of disparate interests into a unified whole, into a formula of words that can be put on paper and enacted into law. The man who, day in and day out, undertakes such work finds himself in a Byzantine world where success and failure hinge on a word that should have been spoken and wasn't or a word that shouldn't have been said and was, on the placing of a comma, the dotting of an "i", the crossing of a "t."

Frequently, the man finds his own personality being colored by the exigencies of his work. There is the temptation to become cautious in words if not in thought, to don a noncommittal mask that, with fine impartiality, can be shown to friend and foe alike. Yielded to often enough, such temptation turns prudence into timidity, subtlety into deviousness.

John Fogarty never became such a man. Probably he was incapable of feeling the temptation. He studied the evidence, decided what was true and then spoke out as plainly, as forcefully and as frequently as he could. It was that simple for him, that fortunate for America.

At the core of John Fogarty's thought was the conviction that the nation didn't care enough about health affairs, that the nation didn't understand as fully as it ought what benefits could be reaped by a total commitment to health research, health education and health care.

He said this often. And to the degree that he could, he did something about it. As history will record, what he did was magnificent. The details of his accomplishment, particularly of his generous concern with dental health, are outlined elsewhere in this issue. They will be his monument. He will need no marble statues, no dedicatory plaques. There will be instead whole generations of Americans, many not even knowing his name, to stand as testament to the sanity, clarity and simplicity of his vision and to the dedication he brought to that vision, an unceasing dedication that, finally, robbed the man himself of life. May he rest in peace.

[Article, Journal of the American Dental Association, February 1967]

THE GENTLEMAN FROM RHODE ISLAND

On January 3, 1941, John Edward Fogarty of Harmony, Rhode Island first took the oath of office as a Member of Congress. Except for a brief interruption during World War II, he held his post in Congress from that day until his sudden, shocking death on January 10, 1967. He was 27 when he first took office and 53 when he died.

Of his 26 years in office, 17 were spent as Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor—Health, Education and Welfare and Related Agencies.

Despite the immense responsibilities he carried for most of the two and one-half decades that he served in Congress, his staff was never a large one. His administrative staff was headed, with warmth and competence, by George J. Kelley and Miss Grace W. Beirne. In his role as Subcommittee Chairman, Mr. Fogarty relied heavily on Robert Moyer, Subcommittee staff assistant.

The flood of tributes unleashed in commemoration of his passing are eloquent testimony to his achievements.

In a statement issued from the White House, President Johnson called Mr. Fogarty "a great leader" and acknowledged him as "a major architect in the fields of health and education."

Speaker McCormack said: "I am shocked and grieved at the death of my dear friend, Congressman John E. Fogarty. Congressman Fogarty was not only a great legislator and a great American, but he was one of God's noblemen. His name will forever occupy prominent pages in the history of our country."

Of all the tributes, however, the one that was perhaps most telling in its simplicity and precision came from Representative Melvin R. Laird. The Republican leader was the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee chaired by Mr. Fogarty. Over the years, the two men had developed an abiding friendship and deep mutual respect. Mourning Mr. Fogarty's death, Representative Laird said: "All Americans who care deeply for the health and welfare of their fellow citizens will know they have lost their most eloquent champion in the House of Representatives."

It was indeed as a "champion" that Mr. Fogarty saw his life's work in Congress. Blunt in his questions, candid in his spoken judgments, he was forever restive in the conviction that the nation wasn't doing enough, didn't care enough about health matters.

That conviction was so consistently held and forcefully stated that, in time, it became contagious. As the Washington *Post* noted in reporting his death, "It became almost a truism that what Mr. Fogarty wanted in public health legislation, Congress granted."

Indeed, it is literally impossible to name a health measure considered over the past 17 years or more than John Fogarty did not help, substantially to shape. In many instances, it was his voice that first sounded the call for new programs.

In no area of health was this more true than in dental health. And no health profession has better reason to honor him or mourn his passing than the dentists.

What was perhaps his initial contribution to dentistry came even before he assumed his Chairmanship when, in the late 1940's, he helped wage the fight in Congress for an independently housed National Institute of Dental Research.

From that time on, he never forgot dentistry. He soon developed an expertise in dental matters that few men, even in the profession itself, could match. And with it came an almost protective attitude toward dental affairs, an eagerness to see potential develop and promise become reality.

It was not a complacent interest. In his unquenchable desire to keep moving ahead, he could be a stern taskmaster. And the man who was not too timid to scold Presidents for giving health affairs too little attention, was not loath to scold others, including those in dentistry, who were not as inventive or as industrious as the gentleman from Rhode Island might wish them to be.

The opposition to fluoridation never ceased to bemuse him. Invariably, when dental witnesses appeared before him, he would ask for a progress report on fluoridation. And it was characteristic of the man, that often he would ask not how the dentists were doing, but how "we" were doing. As with so many other public health measures, fluoridation was not merely something he favored, it was something he was committed to and the fight to win acceptance for it was his fight. It was a personal matter.

That same sense of involvement was present when he undertook his annual examination of the Administration's budget request for dental research activities. He was always less interested in what appeared in the final budget figures than he was in how much these figures had shrunk while the agency's original request had wended its way through the multiple layers of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Budget Bureau. He would probe the testimony, press the witnesses to tell him if more was needed, if some aspect of the program was slowing down because funds weren't available.

And if the answers were persuasive, were sufficiently documented, then the position of the witness became the position of the Chairman as well. And he would fight for it in the Subcommittee, in the full Committee and on the floor of the House.

He won more often than he lost. He won because he was tenacious and forceful and because, in a phrase not invariably applied to a Congressman, he "did his homework." He knew the facts, had a rock-solid command of the details of the situation.

A witness would emerge from his hearing room marveling at the Chairman's intimate knowledge of the field of heart disease. Were that witness to loiter in the corridor long enough, others would come out marveling at the Chairman's knowledge of mental illness, or cancer, or dentistry.

He did not always win. No single will can invariably prevail in the legislative process, it has become too immense and complex. But he never admitted defeat; he merely suffered a setback. He remembered, he kept his conviction and he waited for another day.

Now, of course, there will be no more days for John Fogarty. And his death marks the end of an era as sharply and surely as any man's passing can.

His Rhode Island colleague, Senator John O. Pastore, upon learning of Mr. Fogarty's death, said: "The Congress will not be the same without him." Indeed there is much that will not be the same without him.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, this House and particularly our Appropriations Committee will never be the same without the presence of JOHN FOGARTY.

What a dear friend he was to me and to so many in this House. I would surely have to concur in the many glowing tributes that have been paid to him not only here today but throughout the far reaches of this country from people in all walks of life who came to know him for his good deeds and works.

As the majority leader said he had truly become a legendary figure and I am so honored to have served with him.

Last spring we attended the 19th World Health Assembly in Geneva together as delegates from this House. He was constantly a man on the go and always had that insatiable desire to learn more and acquire as much knowledge as he could in this field in which he has been so acclaimed. Having known that his doctors advised him to slow down because of his heart condition I felt I had to admonish him from time to time, but his stock reply was that he preferred to

live life to the fullest extent and that if the good Lord should see fit to take him—then so be it—he was prepared to go. He was indeed a God-fearing man with so much compassion for his fellow man.

In my home town we were planning to have JOHN participate in a groundbreaking ceremony this year for our Allied Agency project—a research, education, hospital, and rehabilitation center for mentally and physically handicapped children that was born largely through his interest and effort.

Our community will always be grateful to JOHN FOGARTY, the 600 children who some day will be cared for in this facility will I am sure be eternally grateful as will all the mentally and physically handicapped childrer in the country who will be benefited by the research performed at this institution.

My heart is filled with grief at the passing of our friend as we share the burden of this profound loss with his wife, daughter, and family.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sense of personal loss that I rise to join with my fellow members in this body and with mankind at large to salute our late and most distinguished colleague, JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

I was always proud to call him friend, as well as colleague, and my own grief is such only a friend can feel over the sudden loss of another.

As a fellow New Englander, it was my pleasure and honor to work with JOHN FOGARTY on numerous occasions in search of solutions to common problems. Even though we did not share the same party affiliations, he was never one to let partisanship stand in the way of service to his constituents and to his country. And that service, as we all know, was in the highest traditions of public life.

As a member of the human race, subject to the same infirmities and disease that threaten all men, I share in the mood of gratitude and thanksgiving for the understanding, the leadership, and the unswerving dedication that JOHN FOGARTY brought to the fight against sickness, disease, and misery.

As a colleague who was honored to serve with JOHN FOGARTY since I came to the Congress in 1959, I am also grateful for the opportunity to profit from the inspiration of JOHN's public service.

He met his responsibilities with an immense vitality, a penetrating insight, and a keen understanding of the problems at hand. He obtained results by tempering this with an equally firm grasp of both the capacities and limitations of our power to solve these problems. He was a relentless worker, but a quiet, self-effacing one as well. He would deny the immense impact of his achievements while others, including his own President, would applaud and honor him.

His humble origins and early life as a man who made his way by the skills in his hands might not have seemed a promising foundation for one who was to achieve so much later in public life. But, as so many of us know, myself included, the keenest understanding of the problems of humble people and workingmen can best be gained from having shared their life and problems, from having seen the world through their eyes and tasted the frustrations and the triumphs with them.

It was natural for a man of JOHN FOGARTY's background and beliefs to find himself so intimately involved in the fields of health, education, and welfare. As chairman of our Appropriations Subcommittee for those activities, the measure of his labors can be taken on the record of progress of the agencies he helped to finance.

In little more than 10 years, for example, the amount of Federal moneys earmarked for mental health research has grown from an almost meaningless $750,000 to $3.75 million. Twenty years ago, the Congress voted only $3.5 million for the entire operation of the National Institutes of Health. Up to the present fiscal year, JOHN FOGARTY had brought this up to a more realistic $1.5 billion.

Certainly among the greatest monuments to JOHN FOGARTY's memory is the fact that, even during periods of severe economic stress and virtual austerity, his conviction and keen understanding were such that his judgments and recommendations were seldom seriously challenged.

The public honors bestowed on JOHN FOGARTY over the years in recognition of his contributions to health and medical research are a familiar story to all of us in this Chamber—a fact that probably would embarrass JOHN today.

We know, as do the countless beneficiaries of his efforts, how much JOHN FOGARTY will be missed.

And in this sad hour, when many of us still find it difficult to comprehend the sudden, shocking fact of JOHN's death, our most sincere condolences and sympathies go to his surviving family, to his wife Luise and daughter Mary. May they be assured that their burden of grief is shared by every Member of this body.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for yielding. I could not let this moment pass without actually saying a few words about our beloved and departed friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN FOGARTY.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN is gone, but he will always be remembered in the hearts of his colleagues who have served with him. He was popular with all of us. He was popular with his constituents. This is proven by the fact that he was elected 14 consecutive times.

But, Mr. Speaker, he was popular with his colleagues and his constituents because he earned that popularity. He richly deserved the high esteem of his fellow Members. I believe our departed colleague can best be described as a great humanitarian. This is true because of his intense interest in human welfare and particularly his interest in those who had some disability or handicap.

One contribution I may be able to add to this eulogy, is to add to some facts that were mentioned briefly by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY]. This is the fact that for several years JOHN FOGARTY was a mason. I am not now referring to the fraternal order, but the fact he was a brickmason, or a bricklayer.

As far as I know he was the only Member of this body other than myself who had ever earned his livelihood by being a brickmason. I've had several talks with him about our trade. After these conversations I reached the conclusion that it was because of his days as a bricklayer—such was one of the foremost reasons he became interested in better health care for families with low income. He had himself suffered from seasonal unemployment in the building trades. For this reason he had firsthand knowledge of the hardships and heartaches that are suffered by the members of families affected by seasonal unemployment.

Knowing about illness and suffering by those without means to pay for good medical care, in my opinion caused him, when he became a Member of the House of Representatives, to center his interest on this field of public health, and help for the handicapped and disabled.

If we think he was popular among his constituents and popular among his colleagues in the House of Representatives, you should know how well he was received here in Washington 2 or 3 years ago when the building trades sponsored a separate conference for brickmasons. It was my pleasure to attend that convention with JOHN. I can assure my fellow Members he was a hero among those men. He received an ovation that lasted for many, many minutes.

Then last June it was my privilege to be over at Gallaudet College to attend their graduation exercises. JOHN FOGARTY was the speaker. The event was attended by President Johnson. Oh, if all of you could have seen the expression on the faces of those graduates, each knowing how fully and completely that college had been dependent on appropriations worked out by JOHN. They realized they had been equipped to go out into the world as deaf people almost entirely because of the interest over the years in that college by JOHN E. FOGARTY.

All of these things point to the fact JOHN FOGARTY was a good man with a great heart.

We all extend our heartfelt sympathies to his good family in their hour of grief.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not recall an instance in my service in the House of Representatives where there have been more moving tributes paid to a fallen Member of this body than we have heard today in the honor and memory of JOHN FOGARTY.

Certainly it can be said that every

American today can look forward to a longer life and a more healthful life because this man lived and worked among us. It is a wonderful thing to leave this kind of a living monument to service—that which was left by JOHN FOGARTY.

Mr. Speaker, my most vivid memory of this stalwart champion of progressive legislation is the memory I have of the fight which he led on the floor of the House for adequate financing for the health program when we were in the midst of a season of retrenchment and appropriation cuts. To see him stand up against a tide that seemed to be irresistible and to fight courageously and forthrightly for what he believed in and what he believed was good for America was a lesson in legislative statesmanship for me, and one that I will treasure as long as I live.

It has been a privilege to know JOHN FOGARTY, to be his friend, to break bread with him, to share some of the lighter moments of this House with him, and to be in service in this House with him.

I know that everyone who has known him well feels richer by reason of that experience.

To the Fogarty family I wish to extend my own very deep and sincere sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker—

> There are men whom a happy disposition, a strong desire of glory and esteem, inspire with the same love for justice and virtue which men in general have for riches and honors . . . But the number of these men is so small that I only mention them in honor of humanity.

I do not know of whom Helvetius spoke those words, but they are most appropriate in mentioning today, one of that small number, JOHN FOGARTY, whose whole life was a tribute to humanity.

I had the delightful experience of his company on a visit to Ireland last year for the 50th anniversary of the Easter uprising and though we mingled with the country's high officials, JOHN FOGARTY was, as always, at his best when he had an opportunity to meet the little people, to laugh with them, and to look with friendly compassion into their lives.

And also, here at home Congressman FOGARTY went out of his way to personally experience the problems of the people he was representing. At one time in his political career, he resigned from his congressional seat and enlisted incognito as a Seabee in order to observe first hand the problems of the enlisted men who comprise the numerous majority of our fighting men. After serving in their midst in Guam, and gaining a real first hand insight into their situation, he returned to Congress and became the champion of enlisted men through the various branches of our services. Sincerely he wanted to understand the problems of others, and he felt no bitterness at being selected by fate as one of the millions of people in America who suffered from heart disease. Rather he regarded his affliction as an experience mated to him by fate in order that he might better understand and fight for the eradication of this killer of so many of our outstanding citizens.

Ironically, it is the men and women who work the hardest, under the greatest pressure to achieve the most, fighting against time, who frequently expose themselves to this killer of so many of our prime countrymen. A one-time recipient of the American Heart Association's Award for Merit for his outstanding contribution in the fight against heart disease, he is a prime example of the outstanding citizens who all too often are unnecessarily killed by a disease that might well be prevented if only enough time and money are allocated to the study of ways and means to prevent its occurrence and/or control its effects.

Congressman FOGARTY was a man who would sacrifice not only his political advancement—he once declined the senatorial nomination from his State because there was no one to take his place in the House as a champion for medical progress, and the noble Senator LISTER HILL was credibly fulfilling that role in the Senate—but knowing that his own heart was weak, and he should slow his ever busy pace, still he pushed harder for the goal he knew we could and should achieve, even though that push may have cost him his own life. If by his death, we are spurred into action to reach that goal, his death will have accomplished what he strove to in his life.

The loss of this dear friend hung like a dark cloud on the first day of this 90th Congress. But let his memory brighten the days which follow so that through our own rededication, his work may be carried out.

Our prayers are offered at this time for his beloved wife, Luise, his daughter, Mary, his sister, his brothers, and other members of his family in this hour of sorrow.

May God in His infinite mercy grant a place of rest and light to our late beloved colleague, JOHN FOGARTY.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, JOHN FOGARTY's deep and devoted interest in international health and his conviction that through international exchange in the health sciences, a significant contribution could be made not only to the solution of health problems but also to the advancement of world peace is, perhaps, best epitomized in his remarks before a panel on Health for Peace during the meeting of our Citizens Committee for the World Health Organization held in Washington in September 1963. The final paragraph of JOHN's remarks is of particular significance and I should like to quote it here:

> In concluding my remarks I would like to set forth an idea and a view which I feel to be of the greatest importance and significance. Instead of a curtailment of the programs and activities of the United States in the field of international health research, I should like to see a plan to bring into being at Bethesda a great international center for research in biology and medicine dedicated to international cooperation and collaboration in the interests of the health of mankind as so boldly envisaged by the President. This center would encompass conference facilities, laboratory and study space, and living quarters to permit the assembly for discussion, study, and research of the outstanding health scientists of the world. I visualize this center associated with the great facilities of the National Institutes of Health and the National Library of Medicine as representing the visible and tangible embodiment of this Nation's devotion to the use of science for peaceful purposes and the good of mankind.

I can think of no more fitting and lasting tribute to this great humanitarian, than the establishment by this Congress of such a center—the John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences. I have talked with most of the members of our committee about this and they have all been enthusiastic in their support. I am sure that support will be unanimous, both in our committee and in the entire Congress. Not only will such an institution be a living embodiment of the spirit and aspirations of JOHN FOGARTY, but it will serve a needed and valuable role in securing the progress of science in the cause of the well being of all mankind.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep personal loss that I come before the House today. For one of our most respected Members has suddenly been taken from us, Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

Congressman FOGARTY, during his distinguished career, exemplified the best qualities of a public servant. He was dedicated to providing his district and State with representative leadership in Congress. He was unswervingly loyal to our Nation. As a key member of the Appropriations Committee, he worked to insure that the people received the best public service for their tax dollar. From his committee there emanated financial assistance for what were new and untried, until recently, programs to benefit the underprivileged.

I have supported practically all of the legislation sponsored by JOHN FOGARTY because our views were similar insofar as the goal and welfare of the underprivileged people of this Nation are concerned. My support was unsolicited. It was a pleasure and honor to do this.

For 26 years JOHN FOGARTY served this Nation, as a Member of Congress, in the only way he knew how: with honesty and with responsibility. He was an example to all who searched for the best in public life.

As a person, I have lost a true friend. As Members of Congress, we have lost a valiant colleague. As a nation, we have lost a dedicated servant of the people.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I did not have the pleasure of knowing our late colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY, very well. On the few times that I did speak with him and ask him for his help and advice, he went out of his way to be cooperative and to answer my inquiry fully and completely.

Many words have been written and said about the untimely passing of Mr. FOGARTY on how much the Congress, and indeed the entire Nation, will miss him. But, when the words are forgotten, the deeds that JOHN FOGARTY accomplished

will long be remembered. I think the article, written by Dr. Howard Rusk in last Sunday's New York Times, sums up Mr. FOGARTY's achievements, and I am honored to insert it in the RECORD for all Americans to read.

JOHN FOGARTY will be missed by his colleagues, but more important he will be missed by the entire Nation. Ironically, he will be missed most by millions of people who very likely never knew his name, but will reap the benefits of his work and dedication throughout their lives. I am referring to the sick, the handicapped, and all of the unfortunate Americans who suffer a physical or mental disability, as well as those upon whom the burden of their care rests.

I deeply regret the passing of Mr. FOGARTY. I regret that I will be denied the opportunity of getting to know him better. I regret that he will not be here to continue to lead us in the never-ending fight against sickness, disease, and death. I am proud that I did have the opportunity to vote with Mr. FOGARTY on many occasions and I hope to continue to vote for those measures for which Mr. FOGARTY worked and died.

The article referred to follows:

MR. PUBLIC HEALTH: DEATH ENDS EFFORTS BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY TO GIVE UNITED STATES FREEDOM FROM DISEASE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

If hospitals, research laboratories and institutes for the aged, infirmed and retarded had flagpoles, every flag would have flown at half-staff this past week to mourn the loss of John E. Fogarty.

Representative Fogarty of Rhode Island died of a heart attack last Tuesday at the age of 53.

Flags at half-staff would not, however, had been limited to institutions. They would also have been in evidence in thousands of homes throughout Rhode Island and the nation.

Mr. Fogarty was not just interested in institutions and dollars. He was interested in people, and no appeal for help that went to his office was ever left unanswered. He would go to inordinate ends to try to find the solution to problems that were all too often insoluble.

No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

PLANNED NEW CRUSADE

Ironically, his death came just before he was to be sworn in for his 14th term—a time when he was mobilizing his forces for another all-out crusade against disease, disability and death.

Also ironically, his death was caused by a heart attack, his own personal public enemy number one as the primary killer of others.

The contribution of John Fogarty to improving health and rehabilitation services for the American people are legend.

When he entered Congress our Federal investment in medical research was but $3-million. It is now well over $1-billion.

During his freshman year in the House of Representatives, the number of disabled persons rehabilitated into employment under the public program was but 12,000. Last year it was more than 154,000.

Medicare, Medicaid, more nursing home beds, Federal aid for the training of physicians and other health workers, the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health, workshops and classrooms for the mentally retarded and all of the other tremendous advances in health and rehabilitation in the last quarter century stand as monuments to this late "Mr. Public Health."

He and his co-worker in the Senate, Senator Lister Hill from Alabama, were recognized as the great health leaders of all time. They complemented and supplemented each other in their continuing fight for the fifth freedom—freedom from disease.

STARTED AS BRICKLAYER

Mr. Fogarty's formal education ended when he received his high school diploma. He immediately followed in the footsteps of his father and older brother and became an apprentice bricklayer.

He was only 27 when he was first elected to Congress from Rhode Island. During World War II he served as an enlisted man in the Navy construction corps. After the war he returned to Congress to carry the torch for the enlisted men in the armed forces.

Having been denied a formal education and a college degree, he made possible through his untiring efforts the education of literally thousands of others as physicians, scientists and technicians because he cared.

Some years ago Mr. Fogarty was challenged with the opportunity to run for the Senate from Rhode Island. After a great deal of discussion with his friends and colleagues he decided his destiny was in the House of Representatives where he could continue his fight for health as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Health, Education and Welfare.

This was a decision that for suffering humanity was a blessed one.

John Fogarty, who started as a bricklayer, ended his career by placing countless bricks in a solid foundation of modern laboratories, medical schools, hospitals, institutions for the mentally ill and the retarded, and research laboratories that extend from the halls of science to the community itself.

With his bright green tie and his Irish accent, he was a circuit rider for health, a teacher, a preacher, a fearless foe to any challenger who stood in the way of his crusade.

He died on the field of battle. His friends from the scientist to the sick mourn his loss and call him blessed.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked to learn of Congressman JOHN FOGARTY's untimely passing. I do not know of any Congressman that I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving with during my 28 years as a Member of Congress who has impressed me more than our late distinguished friend, JOHN FOGARTY. I could not permit this opportunity to pass without expressing myself concerning the great deeds performed by Congressman FOGARTY during the time he served as a Member of Congress.

I am certain every Member of this body will agree with me that it is doubtful that we would have had a great national medical center established here in this country if it had not been for Congressman FOGARTY. Millions of people living today are enjoying the fruits of this great man's service in the Congress of the United States during the past 25 years. I seriously doubt if there has ever been a living person in this country that has done more for humanity and for the relief of suffering among our people than JOHN FOGARTY.

I am certain that history will recognize JOHN FOGARTY as one of the outstanding statesmen of this age.

I learned to like JOHN very much the first year he was sworn in as a Member of Congress to represent the State of Rhode Island. We shall all greatly miss him and his great leadership in this body, and my deepest sympathy goes out to his lovely family.

I considered JOHN FOGARTY one of my closest, personal, and political friends in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the late Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY was a Congressman in whose service we all can find guidance. He was a man whom we all knew and whom we all respected. His long record of dedicated and inspired service, dating back to 1941, lent dignity and wisdom to these Halls of Congress. It is with great sorrow that we must face the 90th Congress without him.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Education, Welfare, and Related Agencies, he carried on his shoulders the responsibilities of moving this great legislative body through the difficult and trying cold war years. We can all be thankful for his untiring devotion to the ideals and principles of this great country.

We have heard here today many accolades of this great man, and I would just add my word of thanks to him for the example he set and the work he so conscientiously performed. As a man and as a Congressman he will not be forgotten. I can only hope that each of us is able to gain from his example, and carry forth the work he wanted so much to complete in the 90th Congress.

And finally, let us remember that Congressman FOGARTY's efforts to make our country what it is today must have meant many lonely hours and days for him; for leadership and responsibility are unthankful burdens, which few men can carry, and even fewer can carry well. So let us eulogize him not with words, but with action, not with timidity but with strength, and not with dreams but with the courage and fortitude that so well describe JOHN E. FOGARTY.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of our late colleague, the Honorable JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY.

For over a quarter of a century, this dedicated legislator enjoyed the love and respect of his colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives. In turn, he gave unstintingly of his time and energy in the cause of good legislation. He served ably and well the people of his district, his State of Rhode Island, and this Nation.

As chairman for many years of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, our late colleague constantly sought to provide all Americans the opportunity to live richer, fuller, and healthier lives. His many contributions will long be remembered by the millions who were benefited by them. And we of this House, whose own lives have been enriched by his leadership, friendship, and understanding, shall sorely miss his presence.

As a personal friend of JOHN FOGARTY, and for the people of Hawaii, I extend to Mrs. Fogarty and daughter Mary as well as to the other members of Congressman FOGARTY's family my deepest sympathy in this period of sadness.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my humble voice to those we have heard here this afternoon in eulogy to our departed colleague, JOHN FOGARTY.

I shall not attempt here to go into detail in appraisal of the many virtues possessed by our departed friend. This could be almost endless, and yet incomprehensive. But, I think if I were to name the greatest virtue he had, in my opinion, would be his love of his fellow man.

JOHN FOGARTY was a good man. He was a dedicated man.

His friends, both in this House and elsewhere, were not limited. All who knew him not only respected but loved him.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this House and the country as well has suffered an irreparable loss.

I extend my sympathy to his devoted wife and other members of his family.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this tribute to our able and distinguished departed colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY.

None who knew him can refrain from saying all that has been said about him is worthy of repetition here and everywhere.

He was a gentleman who labored long and well for his fellow man.

His death creates a void in his district, State, and Nation. He will be sorely missed by all of us, but most of all by his family.

May his memory be for a blessing forever.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation, the Congress, the State of Rhode Island, and all Americans have suffered a great loss with the passing of JOHN FOGARTY.

He was a man of great understanding and dedication. Although his accomplishments were great and the respect he earned from his colleagues was monumental, he never lost sight of the needs of the ordinary citizen, he never forgot the lessons of his humble origins and his years as a laboring man.

He was an unpretentious man whose greatest pleasure was derived from serving his Nation. The value of that service was well recognized by all of us who knew him and by leaders of government at all levels, but the high esteem in which he was held never affected his great personal modesty.

JOHN FOGARTY will be missed by his Nation, his State, and his friends, but he will not be forgotten. Every future generation of Americans will benefit from the work he pioneered. His greatest monument will be the children who will be saved from mental retardation, the additional happy, useful years enjoyed by those afflicted with heart disease, the cancer patients who will be cured—all as a result of the vision of a great American, JOHN FOGARTY.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of our beloved colleague on January 10, just before the 90th Congress convened, has occurred too recently for us to have adjusted to his absence or to have realized fully how much he will be missed in this body. JOHN FOGARTY, in his career in the House of Representatives, and particularly as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, achieved his own monument in the health and welfare of the American people.

Probably no Member elected to this Congress will have had as lasting an impact on the Nation and its people as the late JOHN FOGARTY. For what he accomplished—the programs of Government he made possible—will grow in significance as the years go by. Infants who might otherwise have died at birth will live and grow healthy to a long and productive lifespan because of JOHN FOGARTY. Every American will enjoy a healthier life because of JOHN FOGARTY. Trained as a bricklayer, he used a good mind and a flair for politics to build, unit by unit, as great building blocks in a great scheme of health research, the renowned National Institutes of Health as part of an expanded U.S. Public Health Service. This will be his greatest monument.

But in our hearts, his monument will ever be the friendliness and warmth of JOHN FOGARTY's personality and character. He was a fine man and a great Member of Congress. He earned every honor of the many which came his way. When Congress is criticized, as it so often is, the existence of our John Fogarty's is usually ignored—but it is the John Fogartys who best reflect the good which is done here, which outlives us all.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of my friend and able colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY.

It was my privilege to serve in the House and on the Committee on Appropriations with JOHN for 20 years. The public service he rendered to his country and countrymen is indeed unsurpassed. His untiring work and ceaseless effort as chairman of the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee on Appropriations resulted in accomplishments that benefited tens of millions of Americans, and his performance is unequaled in the annals of history.

JOHN's success in making available appropriations for medical research will long be remembered, and millions yet unborn will benefit from his foresight. Indeed history will show that his unfailing efforts on behalf of all Americans brought about accomplishments of lasting value to our Nation and its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, indeed it can be said that this world is a better place in which to live for JOHN FOGARTY's having lived in it.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family. My prayers are that our Heavenly Father will comfort them in their great loss and will cast an ever-seeing eye upon them and their future.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened, as I know every Member of this House was, by the sudden and untimely death of our esteemed colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY.

As we all know, there are many criteria by which the people of a given congressional district judge their Congressman because they have diverse views and they expect different things of him.

Once he is seated in the House, he has the added responsibility of satisfying his colleagues. In some ways that is an easier task than satisfying the constituents, but in other ways it is not. For they are in a position to judge him at close range—not on what he says, but on what he does.

It has been my observation that Members of the House judge their colleagues on the basis of two qualities: Does he do his job? Is he easy to get along with?

I am sure the overwhelming majority of the Congress would give JOHN FOGARTY high marks on both counts.

It was my good fortune to know JOHN FOGARTY well and to work closely with him on a number of projects of vital importance to me and my district. He could not have been more helpful if it were his own district that was affected.

It was appropriate that Mr. FOGARTY's special field of interest was health and hospitals, the care of the elderly and the young. It was not just by chance, I am sure, that he turned his talents in those directions. For he was a man of genuine compassion and with a sincere affection for his fellow man.

We will miss him here in the House because of his courtesy and friendliness. The Nation will miss him because of his ability and dedication to those who needed his help.

I extend my deep sympathy to his family in their bereavement.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened at the untimely death of one of our most beloved and respected colleagues, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island. It was my privilege to come to Congress with JOHN FOGARTY and to serve with him throughout the intervening years. We have been very closely associated in the important work of the great Committee on Appropriations. The friendship which I enjoyed with him is one of the things that will live longest in my mind and heart. I knew the color and drama of his personality and I constantly wondered at his outstanding qualities and capabilities, both as a person and as a legislator. He was the living symbol of the quality of endurance, of ruggedness, of forthright honesty, of legislative leadership.

No man who has served in Congress has done as much to improve and advance medical research. His contributions may well prove to be the key which unlocks the door to the final conquest of disease if it comes in our time. Yet, it was one of these dread killers which still scourge mankind that struck him down at the height of his career. Although known to all as a dedicated and loyal son of the Democratic Party, JOHN FOGARTY was first an American. He knew no partisan lines or allegiances in his efforts to serve his country well in those fields which were his bent. He will go down in history as a great American.

Twenty-six years have gone by since he came to Congress, but the memory of JOHN FOGARTY will remain strong in the Halls of Congress for many times 26 years. His contributions are that enduring. I consider it a privilege to add my

praise to his memory and I extend my condolences as a longtime friend to the sorrowing members of his family.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of our colleague and good friend, JOHN FOGARTY, was a personal blow to me and I wish to join my colleagues and take this opportunity to pay tribute to his memory.

In his long and distinguished service in the House of Representatives, JOHN FOGARTY played a key role in shaping national policies in the fields of public and mental health. His personal contributions to the advancement of health education and medical-scientific research were immeasurable. He was so widely recognized as a leader and authority in these fields, it would be redundant for me to dwell on these accomplishments where more than 100 major awards are lasting evidence of his constructive achievements.

More than just as an expert in his field and as a humanitarian, JOHN FOGARTY was equally noted among his colleagues for his self-effacement and modesty. His friendship was deeply valued by all.

In my first term in the House of Representatives—the 88th Congress—JOHN FOGARTY was a fellow member of the University Club and his understanding and cooperation with one very much his junior will long be remembered with gratitude. In the second session of that Congress, it was my distinct privilege and pleasure to serve with JOHN on the Select Committee on Government Research.

In addition to recognizing his boundless enthusiasm and his personal responsibility for many great advances in the fight against sickness and disease in our Nation, I admired him tremendously as a person and as a friend.

Only 2 months ago, he came to New Hampshire where he delivered a great and inspiring speech to a statewide forum on mental retardation. And the evening before his shocking death, we chatted informally in my office, enjoying a pleasant visit, and I told him how much his New Hampshire visit had been appreciated.

At that time, JOHN FOGARTY talked about his plans for the future. There could be no greater tribute to his memory than for the many programs he fostered to be carried on by this and future Congresses.

I will greatly miss his friendship and wise counsel and join my colleagues in extending condolences to his wife and daughter and assuring them of the enduring place their husband and father has won in the hearts and memories of his colleagues.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, today Members of Congress pay a deserving tribute to a great American whose passing leaves a deep void in legislative ranks. JOHN FOGARTY served his district, his State, and his Nation with unequaled distinction. He had become a symbol of health and welfare legislation of the Congress and a champion of health service. His devotion and dedication to his colleagues and his fellow men were exceeded only by his devotion and love for his country.

I am unable to put into words the depth of my feeling for JOHN FOGARTY and what his loss will mean to me personally. But more important is the loss to this great Nation of ours. Only the years ahead will determine the significance of the loss of his outstanding leadership.

This Nation has lost a truly dedicated American and I offer my heartfelt sympathy to his family. I am privileged to have been associated with him and we are all better men because of his presence among us.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, although I as a Congressman never personally worked with the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, his work for the underprivileged, for reform, and for the educational needs of all Americans is well known to me. My chief regret is that I had the opportunity to talk to him on only two occasions. The first of these made a lasting impression on me as to his sincerity and dedication; the second involved a bill which he introduced in the 89th Congress which concerned underprivileged and dependent children and the need for Federal funds to assist State child welfare service programs.

It was with deep regret, felt keenly by all of us, that the opening day of the 90th Congress was marred by the untimely death of our colleague, but his imprint as a veteran Congressman will benefit all newcomers. As freshmen legislators, my colleagues and I must carefully note and study the works of JOHN FOGARTY and let them serve as a guide to future laws which will make our country an even better place in which to live.

He came from humble beginnings, being the son of a laboring man, a bricklayer. He was born in Providence, R.I., in 1913, and eventually became a bricklayer in his own right. He was proud of his craft and his thinking in congressional action depicted his proud feeling for the working man throughout his life.

JOHN FOGARTY rose rapidly in the ranks of organized labor and at the early age of 23 showed his future greatness by becoming president of Bricklayers Union No. 1 of Rhode Island.

While not all thinking men agree on legislation, we must all agree JOHN FOGARTY was an asset to Congress since his election in 1940 at the age of 27.

Not content with sitting back while America fought in World War II, he joined the Navy Seabees, incognito, to learn firsthand the opinions of Americans in uniform. Following the war, he was appointed to the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. It was with this committee that he established himself as a champion of public health facilities. He introduced an aid to education bill to provide funds for both public and parochial schools alike. The measure never passed, but in 1965 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 appears to be an offspring of the Fogarty resolution.

During his years in the Congress, JOHN FOGARTY upgraded national health institutes and encouraged Government research in many areas of human illnesses, both physical and mental.

He was progressive in outlook in the field of social and political reform—more so than some of the conservative views many adhere to. His thinking is definitely in depth and can be used by both conservatives and liberals alike to better America.

His record of continuous public service and knowledge of American needs made him an outstanding member of our country and Government. His life was a tribute to both his State and the Nation.

JOHN FOGARTY walked hand in hand with greatness.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to adequately express my grief at the untimely news of the death of our beloved colleague from Rhode Island, JOHN FOGARTY. He was, in the fullest and rarest sense of the phrase, a good man. As a representative of his constituents, he was tireless. As a leading Member of this House—as chairman of the vitally important Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare funds, he was, perhaps more than any other single Member of this body, responsible for a major part of what this Nation has been able to do to further education, improve the health of all our citizens, and of the society itself.

JOHN FOGARTY's memorial will not be of bronze or marble. His memorial lives and breathes and walks among us. His memorial is every man and woman and child whose life has been saved or prolonged by the work of the various National Institutes of Health. His memorial is to be found in every classroom in this Nation, where young people are receiving a better education because of JOHN FOGARTY's understanding and compassionate handling of the appropriations bills that came before his subcommittee.

I remember vividly, in the first term I spent here after returning to the Congress in 1956, when the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill was on the floor of this House for a week—one of the longest and most embattled weeks I have ever seen in this House. There was a great cut-the-budget furor that year, and it was on JOHN FOGARTY's bill that most of the attention was focused. For 5 long days he stood at his desk on this floor and reasoned with a House that on Monday was not in a mood to listen to reason. By Friday, his knowledge of the minutiae of the budget, and of the substance of the programs which the economizers were trying to cut, had turned the tide, and, to a great extent, the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare were able to be given the funds they needed for their important work. No one who remembers that week—and it is not an easy one to forget—will ever forget the calm quiet with which JOHN FOGARTY was able to transform a budget-cutting stampede into an exercise in responsible legislative behavior.

That week was not, certainly, JOHN FOGARTY's only act of quiet, self-effacing heroism during his membership in this House. His whole career was dedicated to the concept that human lives and human minds were more important than a balance sheet—and that economy and miserliness were not the same thing.

What he was able to do will, I am confident, continue to be done by his suc-

cessors and his colleagues. But, Mr. Speaker, we will not see a greater man than JOHN FOGARTY, a more compassionate man, a more understanding man. The Nation, this House, have been permanently impoverished by JOHN FOGARTY's departure.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, JOHN FOGARTY's most lasting memorial will not be what we say here, but the affection in which he is held by a grateful nation.

Years ago when his goals seemed unobtainable, JOHN FOGARTY set out to provide better medical care and facilities for the American people. Rhode Island and his country are proud that he persevered in his 26 years in Congress. Today there innumerable health and welfare laws that owe their existence to JOHN FOGARTY and medical facilities across the Nation that attest to his success.

During my years in Congress I have served on the Commerce Committee which has authorized much of the legislation sponsored by JOHN FOGARTY. I have always been impressed by the deep sincerity of his devotion to his cause. JOHN was a true liberal in the best sense of that word.

Both on the door of his congressional office and in his campaign literature, a green bow tie was much in evidence. JOHN was proud of his Irish heritage. In his district that green bow tie became his trademark.

After his last victory—and perhaps it was true in other elections—he thanked his constituents by superimposing upon his campaign billboards red letters spelling out "thank you" to his constituents. Even as JOHN thanked his constituents—we, his colleagues in Congress, thank him for the legacy he has left a grateful nation.

JOHN FOGARTY's life may have been shortened by his works to lengthen our lives.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the opening day of this Congress was darkened for us all by the death of our colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY.

In matters of health affecting the entire Nation, JOHN FOGARTY's influence and leadership were unsurpassed. As a subcommittee member, I well remember the study, made in the last Congress, of the organization of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Virtually every official who testified paid tribute to JOHN FOGARTY and his constructive approach to the problems confronting the Department in the field of medical research.

During his lifetime, JOHN FOGARTY was honored with the Albert Lasker Award and the Leadership Award of the Kennedy Foundation. Now that he is gone, we can do little more than say this was a man who served with distinction both Congress and the Nation—and that the health of all of us has been safeguarded because he lived.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I rise to pay tribute to an old and trusted friend, JOHN FOGARTY, who was taken away from us by death on the opening day of the 90th Congress, 26 years and 7 days from the time he first took the oath of office as a Member of the 77th Congress. All during that period he had given his native State of Rhode Island and this Nation a kind of service which is rarely seen in this body or in any legislative assembly.

Day in, day out, JOHN FOGARTY served the House as a member of the powerful Committee on Appropriations and his work in the field of health and welfare legislation will redound eternally to his credit. Never seeking any personal aggrandizement, JOHN FOGARTY performed his duties in a conscientious and self-effacing way. Millions of Americans will enjoy better health only because of the efforts of the late beloved JOHN FOGARTY. And yet, they will never know the name of their benefactor. This is the way JOHN FOGARTY would have preferred it.

I know that we shall not see his like in this body for a long time, but each of us present today, is well aware that the Congress of the United States is a better place for having had the service of JOHN FOGARTY over the last quarter century.

Mrs. Daniels joins with me in wishing to our dear friend the eternal peace which he so richly merits. Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues in the House, I was stunned at the sudden passing of JOHN E. FOGARTY.

I had the pleasure of serving in the House with Congressman FOGARTY for 24 years. During that time, he proved to the people of his State and the Nation a most unusual capacity for legislative excellency.

Without question, he was the greatest champion of health research and health services to the people of our Nation of any Member of Congress. Time after time, he stood in the well of the House and argued for greater appropriations for medical research and the development of medical and surgical technics. There is no way of estimating the value of his contribution in terms of release from physical suffering and extension of the life period and improvement of the health of our people.

We shall mourn him as a champion in his chosen fields of interest and we can only hope that there will arise in the House of Representatives a man with his deep faith and love of humanity and that there will arise a man with the will and determination to do something in a practical way toward solving the age-old problem of disease and human suffering.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I join you today in remembering and honoring the late JOHN E. FOGARTY, Representative from Rhode Island.

JOHN FOGARTY devoted his entire adult life to the people of his district, the Congress and, most of all, to the health and the education of all Americans. He recognized the worth and the long-range significance of educating our young, probing the mysteries of disease and securing our future years. Those of us who share JOHN FOGARTY's commitment to these goals feel deeply the loss of this man. As an innovative planner and a constant defender of health and welfare legislation, he fulfilled the concept of public serivce to the highest degree.

It is to his life and his leadership that we pay tribute today.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, when this honorable body met last week to take the oath of office for service in the 90th Congress, it was a shocked and saddened House. One of our most respected Members did not appear to take his oath, for JOHN E. FOGARTY was dead. He died in his office just 2 hours prior to the convening of the session, after apparently being stricken by a massive heart attack.

The Congressional Directory, where Congressman FOGARTY could have said hundreds of words in his biography, carried only this simple phrase, "a Democrat, of Harmony, R.I., elected in 1940; re-elected to succeeding Congresses." We can add this postscript to these remarks, "died in office in the service of his constituents and his country."

In the 16 years that our departed colleague served as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling labor, health, education, and welfare funds, he has gained a reputation for his efforts in bolstering health research.

During his years on the committee, appropriations of the National Institutes of Health rose from $3.5 million in 1946 to $1.5 billion for the current fiscal year. This is evidence of his deep interest in health research and his determination to make this country first in health.

Though his voice will be missed in these Chambers, his past actions to ease human suffering will never be forgotten.

I extend to his wife, Luise, and to their daughter, Mary, my most profound sympathy on the loss of a beloved husband and father.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, death has taken from our midst and the country a dedicated and distinguished public servant, Congressman JOHN FOGARTY.

The record of his accomplishments is well known to us. All who had the honor of serving with him are aware of his great contribution and keen interest in the field of medicine and medical research. Few men have been so devoted in their efforts to provide a healthier life for Americans. He labored long and tirelessly to give us the greatest public and private health service in the world.

JOHN FOGARTY was among my closest friends since I have been in the House. His untimely passing came as a terrible shock to me, and to all who knew and respected him.

Sadly, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to our late departed friend and colleague in the House, JOHN FOGARTY.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily the opening day of a Congress is one of happiness as well as solemnity. Such was not the case when we met to convene the 90th Congress. This was a sad and solemn occasion because of the news that our friend and colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY, had passed away.

Representative FOGARTY was first elected in 1940 to serve the citizens of the Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, and he served them and the Nation for 26 years.

He was a quiet man and when he spoke,

people listened. He was a friend to all but a particular friend to those who were interested in improving the health of the people of our great Nation. The mentally retarded children owe much to this great humanitarian who served his country wisely and well.

Those of us who were privileged to serve with him will miss his leadership and guidance. The freshmen Members of Congress will suffer because they were not able to benefit from his guidance and wisdom. The citizens of Rhode Island whom he represented so wisely, will suffer, as will the Nation as a whole.

During his political career he received many awards, all of which were deserved. I have no award to offer JOHN FOGARTY now. All I can do is commend him for the fine work he did as a dedicated servant of the people. May he, in his final hour, rest in peace.

Mrs. Johnson and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife, Luise, and to his daughter, Mary. Our prayers are with them.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I, along with all my colleagues, was most shocked and saddened at the untimely death of Representative JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY at the very outset of his 14th term in Congress.

Like many other junior Members of this House, I found inspiration and leadership in the person of this dedicated public servant who has done so much for so many Americans in his brilliant legislative career. It was difficult to accept his sudden death of January 10, and for most of us the convening of the 90th Congress was darkened by the news that JOHN FOGARTY would not be among us for the opening ceremony.

Congressman FOGARTY's contributions to the welfare of his fellow men were so numerous that he was dubbed "Mr. Public Health" in tribute, and those of us on the threshold of our legislative careers look upon his achievements with admiration. A forerunner of the Great Society, Representative FOGARTY was as much responsible as any other individual for the great increases in health services, health facilities, and health research throughout the country since he began his congressional career in 1941 at the age of 27.

Rising to the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor, HEW, and Related Agencies, Congressman FOGARTY led the battle for medicare, Federal aid for training of doctors and other medical personnel, workshops and classrooms for the mentally retarded, and a host of other significant advances in the public health field. The National Institutes of Health stand as an enduring monument to the concern for human welfare evidenced by this legislator whose contributions will be of lasting benefit to living Americans and generations to come.

We have lost a leader, a great and distinguished Congressman who worked quietly and effectively to make the world a better place in which to live. Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to his family, whose tragic loss is also the country's loss. JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY played his role in the history of the Nation and left behind him a record that will serve as a beacon to all the rest of us striving to find the means by which we can also make our contribution.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this House goes untouched, if only in some small way, by the death of a fellow Member.

The loss of some Members is, of course, felt more acutely than the loss of others. Seniority, influence, popularity all contribute to the impact on these Chambers of the sudden passing of a Member.

Few men would be missed as much as JOHN FOGARTY. He combined all the attributes of an effective legislator and a fine man. Having served 13 terms, he was a seasoned Congressman. His experience earned him the respect of all who knew him. Experience combined with respect gave him influence.

Yet these qualities in themselves mean little when we honor the memory of JOHN FOGARTY if we fail to mention his qualities as a human being. He combined dedication to his congressional duties with warmth and compassion that made him not only an outstanding committee chairman but a personal friend to all of us.

Beyond his personal friendships, Mr. FOGARTY had the opportunity, through his committee chairmanship, to put his humanitarianism to work for the people of this Nation. His was an open heart. By opening his heart to the needs of the people, he helped to improve the lives of millions of Americans.

We will all miss JOHN FOGARTY.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I was astonished and shocked to learn on Tuesday, January 10, of the sudden passing of our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY. I have known him during my entire 14 years of service in the Congress of the United States. He was an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives, dedicated and devoted to the highest public good. His services here were outstanding, and he enjoyed in an unusually high degree the confidence and esteem of all who knew him.

I did not have the privilege of serving on the same committee with Representative FOGARTY, but have heard him many times on the floor of the House of Representatives when he reported bills from his committee. He handled these bills in a very dextrous and skillful manner and displayed his extraordinary abilities in such a way as to gain the support of a majority and the admiration and confidence of all who knew him.

On Monday, January 9, around noon, I was standing at the lunch counter in the cloakroom of the House of Representatives when he came to the counter. We stood there alone and had a somewhat prolonged and very friendly conversation about matters in general. I never saw him look better. As we bade each other farewell, little did I realize that the final summons was so near and that I would never in this world have the privilege and the pleasure of looking upon him again.

We will ever cherish the memory of our association with JOHN FOGARTY. The exemplary life which he led should animate us all to a higher and renewed consecration and to worthy and unselfish devotion to our country and our kind.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely passing of our late colleague, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, has grieved the entire Nation. Throughout the 26 years of his service as Representative in the U.S. Congress for the Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, he gave unstintingly of his efforts to promote the health and welfare of the citizens of this country. The Nation is deeply indebted to him.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute today to a great patriot and an outstanding citizen—a man of courage and integrity, whose concern for his fellow citizen has not been surpassed. It was a privilege to know him and to work with him.

To his wife and his family, I extend my sincere and deepest condolences.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I share with all my colleagues a deep sense of loss on the passing of JOHN FOGARTY. Modestly and without fanfare, this one humble man contributed mightily to the health and welfare of the American people.

As a friend and colleague of JOHN FOGARTY, I feel a sense of personal loss. The Nation itself has also been deprived of a great and effective humanitarian. Those of us who remain must profit by the example of JOHN FOGARTY and do our best to combat the ancient enemies of mankind, which are disease and ignorance.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my sorrow and profound sense of personal loss at the passing of JOHN FOGARTY. I offer my deepest sympathy to his widow and his family.

JOHN FOGARTY, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, has made contributions to our great Nation unrivaled in their farsightedness and benefit to all Americans. His broad intellectual powers coupled with a persistent and incredible ability to get things done have truly made him a champion of better mental and physical health. The great strides forward in curing killing and crippling diseases have been made in large part because of the vision and competence of our departed colleague.

I feel my life has been significantly enriched by virtue of my association with him. On a number of occasions I was privileged to meet and confer with JOHN in his office after the close of daily business. I remember well, too, the opening day baseball games we attended together at District of Columbia Stadium. Always a rooter for the underdog, the underprivileged—the one who needed help the most—JOHN FOGARTY was a giant of a man in every way. The fullness of life for everyone who knew JOHN will now be diminished by virtue of his passing.

Over the years many monuments have been erected to Congressman FOGARTY's honor. Long after these token structures have crumbled, his memory will serve as a living monument in the hearts of future Americans.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep and profound sympathy that I join my distinguished colleagues of this House this morning to pay my deep and sincerest tribute to our beloved, late JOHN FOGARTY.

I had the privilege of serving with him on the Appropriations Committee here. His excellent work will be a guidepost for this Nation's welfare for years to come.

JOHN FOGARTY was a magnificent friend and magnificent representative of all the people, including his own State. His deep and abiding concern for the poor, the sick, the unfortunate, was a shining symbol of democracy itself.

This Nation is poorer for the passing of JOHN FOGARTY. The deaf, the blind, the underprivileged, have lost their loudest and kindest voice.

To Mrs. Fogarty and to his family, my deepest and sincerest sympathy.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound shock and regret that I heard the news of JOHN FOGARTY'S death on the opening day of this 90th Congress, and I join his friends and colleagues today in paying tribute to his memory, and extending sympathy to his widow and family.

I believe it was Disraeli who said that the health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a state depend. Surely the people of this Nation are forever in the debt of JOHN FOGARTY, for it was primarily with the health of the people that his service was dedicated during 16 years in the Congress.

JOHN FOGARTY was a bricklayer and enlisted man in the Navy before he came to Washington to serve the Second District of Rhode Island as an active member of the Appropriations Committee, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. It was his compassionate interest in people, coupled with his courage and foresight in their needs which made possible the pioneer efforts to achieve the remarkable health resources this Nation enjoys.

But JOHN FOGARTY did not limit his interest to man's physical well-being. He wanted to enrich the intellectual and cultural life of Americans. Congressman FOGARTY was in large measure responsible for bringing to life the legislation to establish the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

I shall personally miss JOHN FOGARTY, and the Congress and country will be the poorer without his strength and leadership.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to express oneself adequately at the passing of a friend and colleague. It is even more difficult when that friend and colleague has done so much for his country, for the individual, and for the dignity of mankind.

Over a span of 26 years, Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY devoted his life to the relief of pain, to a universal improvement in health standards, and to the eradication of diseases that instill fear in the hearts of men. To enumerate each instance of his contribution to the health and welfare of his fellow citizens would be impossible because so many of his efforts were hidden under a personal cloak of modesty.

During his many years of service, he came to be known as the champion of better health for the Nation. This is a tribute to the multitude of progressive health and welfare legislation in which he took a personal interest from the moment of its introduction to the moment of enactment. The Nation was indeed fortunate to have him serve for 16 years as chairman of the Appropriations Committee's subcommittee providing funds for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

The greatest tribute that we, who remain behind, can offer the memory of JOHN FOGARTY is to continue to support vigorously the many noble programs that he initiated and guided to fruition.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his wife and family in this moment of their deep sorrow.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, by his sudden passing, we have lost in JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, a dear friend and a respected colleague. His efforts over the years won for him a justly deserved reputation as a major architect of the Federal Government's program of medical research.

His formal education ended with high school, and his trade when he entered the House as a Member from Rhode Island was that of a bricklayer, yet at the time of his death it was generally acknowledged by the medical profession that he possessed an incredibly deep and extensive knowledge of the field of medical research. In his characteristically modest way, he offered as an explanation of his acquisition of this knowledge the remark:

> I live this thing all year around.

One of his best known approaches as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that handled requests for medical research funds was to demand that administrators of the National Institutes of Health make judgments about their budgetary needs as professional medical men and not merely as defenders of a budget that had emerged from the Bureau of the Budget.

Thus it was that on the day of his death, if hospitals, research laboratories, and medical facilities for the aged, the infirm, and the mentally retarded had all had flagpoles, the flags upon them would have been flying at half staff. The New York Times medical columnist wrote of him:

> No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities, and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

His passing came as he was about to begin his 14th term, and he had planned to carry on during the 90th Congress his wide-ranging activities, on the Appropriations Committee and on the floor of the House, against mankind's great enemies, disease, disability, and death.

No one could have done more than he did in his chosen cause. An extremely affecting cartoon appeared in the Providence Journal in the issue reporting his death. It showed a large monument of brick on which there is a plaque reading "Historical Advancements in the Nation's Health and Welfare." In front of the monument is a bricklayer's trowel that has been set down on the ground in the midst of work that it was being used for. On the handle of the trowel are the initials of JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY. The caption of the drawing reads: "A Bricklayer's Legacy."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, when JOHN FOGARTY passed away, a giant fell in the service of America. As a Member of the other body, as well as this House, I had the privilege of working closely with JOHN FOGARTY in the all-important field of health. Few men in our Nation's history have done more than he to lengthen the lives, to promote the health, and to increase the happiness of the American people. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the House Appropriations Committee, he led the fight for more research funds to discover the cause and cure of the great killers and cripplers among the diseases and to increase the personnel and the facilities of our Nation, both to prevent and to treat disease. Millions alive today owe the joy of life to the fruits of research which JOHN FOGARTY made possible. Millions know health today through the curative facilities and services which he made possible.

JOHN FOGARTY loved humanity and he sought to save it and to serve it. He believed that man was made in the image of God and that as a child of God he was precious, and to save or to enrich his life was the noblest of human endeavors.

JOHN FOGARTY never spared himself in the service of his fellow man. With faithful dedication and unremitting diligence year by year, month by month, day by day, and hour by hour, he strove to make things better for all the people of this land he loved. His warm heart was concerned for every man in need, oppressed, handicapped, or denied the fullness of life which he, in such large measure, enjoyed.

JOHN FOGARTY was the symbol of the finest in public and private life. His public character was the essence of integrity; his private life an example of rectitude. Wherever this man moved, he served; and wherever he labored, he was honored; and wherever he was known, he was loved. And now for the inspiration of the future, we have the memory of JOHN FOGARTY to cherish and his life to emulate. His name shall be imperishable in the annals of our Congress and country and in the richer glories of life which he has made possible for this and generations yet to come.

To Mrs. Fogarty and one lovely daughter who remain behind, we send our greatest respect and our tenderest sympathy.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the true satisfactions of serving in the Congress has been the opportunity to know and to work with those all-too-few men who freely spend their lives adding to the lives of others; men who, to our good fortune, chose the often hard political arena that they might work for all their fellow men. JOHN FOGARTY was one of those.

We meet this year without him. Those of us who are returning know we have lost a friend, and that humanity has lost a champion. Those who this year come to these halls for the first time have been denied a rare privilege in personal and professional association.

Many years ago, fairly early in my service in the House, a fellow Member during a debate described the idealists

among us as cloud riders. JOHN FOGARTY was one of them, but he was not only an idealist devoted to working for humanity; he was also enough of a realist to be able to work more effectively in the particular field he chose than perhaps any other Member of Congress has ever done.

Thanks to him and a handful of men like him, the Federal Government has taken great strides in furthering medical research and in other similar fields directed toward improving the lives of our people and people everywhere. I hope that someday someone will write, for all to know, the story of the work of JOHN FOGARTY, whose definition of public interest was sensitive enough to include, and whose dedication was intense enough to secure, programs like the reading records for the blind distributed by the Library of Congress; the Library Services Act, which has carried books to nearly every crossroads and hamlet in the land; and the training of teachers for deaf children, to mention only a few. The list of his legislative gifts to the Nation is long, and we have watched him with profound affection and respect as he labored, and counted it a privilege to help when we could.

History all too often holds its places of honor for the popular public heroes, but a place of honor will always remain here in the House, and in our hearts, for JOHN FOGARTY. If there is a need for idealists in the better world beyond, he will be filling it. I hope those of us who are here will be equal to carrying on the task he left behind.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY. JOHN FOGARTY's name was synonymous with health research. By his dedication to the cause of improved health he demonstrated the far-reaching impact of a single member of the House Appropriations Committee who uses his influence wisely and for the public good. His example is one to emulate. His contribution to humanity is lasting.

Through his leadership the Federal Government assumed an active role in promoting the health of the Nation. During his service in the Congress the Federal investment in medical research grew from $3 million to over $1 billion. He was, indeed, "Mr. Public Health."

As Dr. Howard A. Rusk wrote in last Sunday's New York Times:

> If hospitals, research laboratories and institutes for the aged, infirmed and retarded had flagpoles, every flag would have flown at half-staff this past week to mourn the loss of John E. Fogarty.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleagues in paying final respects to the late JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY of Rhode Island. His loyal and unflagging efforts in the service of his district, State, and country have earned the respect and affection of his colleagues who deeply regret and mark his passing.

He will be sorely missed and long remembered by his dear friends and loving family. As a new Member of Congress, I deeply regret that I shall not have the opportunity to be associated with Mr. FOGARTY. The loss of his years of experience and ability is an unfortunate and tremendous loss to the Congress and to our country. I offer my deepest regrets to the family and join my colleagues in noting this great loss.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, with the other Members of the House, I share a profound sense of shock and deep sadness over the death of our good friend and colleague from Rhode Island, JOHN FOGARTY.

JOHN rose from humble beginnings through education and hard work to become one of the most distinguished and effective Members of the House. He was a vigorous advocate of forward-looking legislation, particularly in the field of medicine and public health. Because of his deep compassion for the sick, the blind, the deaf, and the mentally retarded, he led a legislative crusade to provide massive assistance for these unfortunate people, and was rightfully called, "Mr. Public Health."

JOHN will be sorely missed by his many friends on both sides of the aisle, as well as the multitude of people who have benefited from the numerous measures which have become law through his dedicated efforts.

I join his host of other friends in extending deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of loss and privilege that I join in paying deserved tribute to our late colleague, JOHN FOGARTY.

He would have been in his 27th year of service in the House of Representatives were he with us today. That is a privilege afforded few men and he fulfilled, in every respect, the duties and responsibilities incumbent in that privilege. Our loss then, is his talent, his ability and his friendship. He leaves, however, a great measure of accomplishment.

It was a privilege to serve with JOHN FOGARTY over the past 4 years. He was ever eager to assist his fellow Members in any manner possible.

JOHN FOGARTY will be missed but the work he has done here will contribute to a brighter future America for future generations.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my sadness over the death of JOHN FOGARTY.

It is not only a loss to the Congress, but a loss to the people of Rhode Island and the people of the Nation.

In working with Congressman FOGARTY for the past 12 years, I learned to respect and admire him both as a man and as a legislator.

JOHN FOGARTY was a man of ideals and foresight. One known across the Nation as a champion of better health for all.

In his 26 years of service, he has won the respect and admiration of those on both sides of the aisle and with good reason.

We will all miss his guidance, wisdom and companionship.

My wife Becky and I extend our deepest sympathy to JOHN's wife and daughter and ask God's blessing upon them.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, one measure of the size of a man is whether, in a position of power, he can be very strong and at the same time kindly; beset by a myriad of great and pressing problems, still spare time to be sympathetic to the lesser problems of comparative strangers. Such a man, as I know from my own experience, was the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY.

I need not expound to anyone in this body the difficulties and confusions which greet a freshman Member of Congress. We have all been there, and I am sure the memory is still vivid to each of us. We need a lot of understanding, many helping hands, much counsel, and assistance from our seniors who have plenty of problems of their own.

And we get it, from some of the busiest and most important people in the country, here on Capitol Hill.

As a freshman in the 89th Congress, I had a problem which required Mr. FOGARTY's help. I got his help. Patiently, courteously, and positively, Mr. FOGARTY helped me to solve that problem. This is one sophomore Congressman who will miss Mr. FOGARTY very much, personally.

Less personally, I will miss Mr. FOGARTY as an American, for he contributed to the greatness of his country far more than is required of most Americans. He gave more, and I believe he received more in the way of satisfaction and the knowledge that he was serving better than most.

The great job he did, and the manner in which he did it, should serve as an example of honorable and dedicated service to all of us. We miss him and wish he were still here with us, but we also can be grateful that he left us so much of himself.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored for this opportunity to join my colleagues in eulogizing our former colleague, the late JOHN FOGARTY.

JOHN FOGARTY was a builder in fact and in performance, and probably the greatest monument anyone has built for a cause has been his work in the area of allied health, especially the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation.

Like building a strong wall, JOHN FOGARTY added, on a day-to-day, month-to-month basis, accomplishments and efforts that together have made the health program of this Nation the envy of the world.

He was fearless in debate on the floor, in the handling of bills and in taking policy stands for his beliefs. JOHN FOGARTY was firm, resolute, and never wavered.

Generations to come will always remember and honor the man JOHN FOGARTY for his interest in the welfare of mankind.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the 90th Congress had a sad beginning when death claimed our friend and colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY, just a few hours before he was to have been sworn in for his 14th term in the House of Representatives.

JOHN FOGARTY had completed 26 years of distinguished service in this body, and we shall miss him deeply. I know of no one in our Federal Government who has done more to promote better health in our country. His warm, humanitarian spirit was constantly seeking answers to the problems of disease, the mentally ill, the retarded, the blind and deaf. His persistent efforts to promote research and secure new health programs, medi-

care, nursing homes, health centers, programs to provide education and training for physicians, technicians, and scientists, brought him deserved recognition as a great humanitarian.

In Congress and throughout the country, JOHN FOGARTY was known as the champion for better health for the Nation. I extend to his family my deepest sympathy and condolences. They may take solace in the knowledge that his outstanding career in the House of Representatives, and particularly his contributions to the health and welfare of our Nation, leaves its impact and will not be forgotten.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the death of our colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY, deprives America of a legislator with a breadth of humanitarian vision that will be deeply missed. His tireless efforts on behalf of the health of his fellow citizens gave major thrust to needed Federal support for basic research in cancer, heart, and other diseases. The importance of the National Institutes of Health as one of the major medical research centers in the world is largely a tribute to his continual concern as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare. My deepest sympathy is extended to his wife and daughter.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the office of the late JOHN FOGARTY is just a few steps down the hall from mine, and, on more than one occasion, it was my privilege to fall in step with him as we went about our business.

He will ever stand out in my mind as a conscientious, hard-working, and remarkably understanding man. His death, just a few hours before the opening of the 90th Congress, was a profound shock to me. The United States and the State of Rhode Island have lost a fine public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I join in extending condolences to his family.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, the eminent authority, physician, and writer for the New York Times, who specializes in matters of health and medicine, has written a most perceptive and complimentary eulogy of our great friend and colleague, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island. I would like to include the article that Dr. Rusk had published in the January 15 edition of the New York Times.

I know that all of my colleagues share with me and with Dr. Rusk our sincerest sympathies, not only for Mrs. Fogarty and her daughter, Mary, but the entire Fogarty family and the country, all of whom have lost a true champion.

The eulogy referred to follows:

MR. PUBLIC HEALTH: DEATH ENDS EFFORTS BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY TO GIVE UNITED STATES FREEDOM FROM DISEASE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

If hospitals, research laboratories and institutes for the aged, infirmed and retarded had flagpoles, every flag would have flown at half-staff this past week to mourn the loss of John E. Fogarty.

Representative Fogarty of Rhode Island died of a heart attack last Tuesday at the age of 53.

Flags at half-staff would not, however, have been limited to institutions. They would also have been in evidence in thousands of homes throughout Rhode Island and the nation.

Mr. Fogarty was not just interested in institutions and dollars. He was interested in people, and no appeal for help that went to his office was ever left unanswered. He would go to inordinate ends to try to find the solution to problems that were all too often insoluble.

No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

PLANNED NEW CRUSADE

Ironically, his death came just before he was to be sworn in for his 14th term—a time when he was mobilizing his forces for another all-out crusade against disease, disability and death.

Also ironically, his death was caused by a heart attack, his own personal public enemy number one as the primary killer of others.

The contribution of John Fogarty to improving health and rehabilitation services for the American people are legend.

When he entered Congress our Federal investment in medical research was but $3-million. It is now well over $1-billion.

During his freshman year in the House of Representatives, the number of disabled persons rehabilitated into employment under the public program was but 12,000. Last year it was more than 154,000.

Medicare, Medicaid, more nursing home beds, Federal aid for the training of physicians and other health workers, the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health, workshops and classrooms for the mentally retarded and all of the other tremendous advances in health and rehabilitation in the last quarter century stand as monuments to this late "Mr. Public Health."

He and his co-worker in the Senate, Senator Lister Hill from Alabama, were recognized as the great health leaders of all time. They complemented and supplemented each other in their continuing fight for the fifth freedom—freedom from disease.

STARTED AS BRICKLAYER

Mr. Fogarty's formal education ended when he received his high school diploma. He immediately followed in the footsteps of his father and older brother and became an apprentice bricklayer.

He was only 27 when he was first elected to Congress from Rhode Island. During World War II he served as an enlisted man in the Navy construction corps. After the war he returned to Congress to carry the torch for the enlisted men in the armed forces.

Having been denied a formal education and a college degree, he made possible through his untiring efforts the education of literally thousands of others as physicians, scientists and technicians because he cared.

Some years ago Mr. Fogarty was challenged with the opportunity to run for the Senate from Rhode Island. After a great deal of discussion with his friends and colleagues he decided his destiny was in the House of Representatives where he could continue his fight for health as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Health, Education and Welfare.

This was a decision that for suffering humanity was a blessed one.

John Fogarty, who started as a bricklayer, ended his career by placing countless bricks in a solid foundation of modern laboratories, medical schools, hospitals, institutions for the mentally ill and the retarded, and research laboratories that extend from the halls of science to the community itself.

With his bright green tie and his Irish accent, he was a circuit rider for health, a teacher, a preacher, a fearless foe to any challenger who stood in the way of his crusade.

He died on the field of battle. His friends from the scientist to the sick mourn his loss and call him blessed.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, of all the accomplishments of all the men and women who have ever passed through this Congress, the people of the world should be most grateful for JOHN FOGARTY'S. Men and women, who in past generations, would have become invalids or died, will live in good health because of JOHN FOGARTY'S work in this Congress in the health fields. Children who would never have had a chance will live to grow into healthy adulthood because JOHN FOGARTY cared enough about the health of the Nation to make it his life's work.

We in this Congress will miss him. With his family, we will grieve for him, but the world and Rhode Island should rejoice that they did not miss having him serve in this body.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, when Congressman JOHN FOGARTY died on the opening day of this 90th Congress it was a great shock to us all. At the comparatively young age of 54 he really passed on in the prime of life, which in itself is tragic. But what makes it doubly tragic is the fact that he still had great contributions to make to this land he loved—contributions in the fields of labor, health, and education, and welfare.

As the longtime chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, on which I have the honor of sitting, I know at firsthand of the effective work he accomplished for the welfare of our country.

Whatever JOHN FOGARTY undertook he performed in an excellent manner. In his early years he was a bricklayer. I am certain there was no better bricklayer in the State of Rhode Island than JOHN FOGARTY. When he first came to the Halls of Congress over a quarter century ago, I am sure it was his objective to become one of the best and most effective legislators in this body. And he was.

Last April, Mr. Speaker, JOHN FOGARTY and I journeyed to Dublin, Ireland, to dedicate a statue to that great Irish patriot, Robert Emmett. FOGARTY and FLOOD in Ireland together. I would say nothing could be more fitting and appropriate. The people of Dublin were delighted to meet this handsome and charming Irishman from Rhode Island.

In the tradition of the Irish people JOHN FOGARTY was a strong-willed independent thinker and he spoke his mind. You always know where you stood with JOHN FOGARTY. He threw you no curves, used no deception. These qualities of character are the very attributes that endeared JOHN FOGARTY to the multitudes that knew him for so many years.

Last Friday, it was my sad duty to journey to Providence, R.I., to pay my final respects to this dear friend and longtime colleague. It was one of the most trying and difficult things to do. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that in all the years I have been in Congress and at all such sad occasions, I have never seen such an outpouring of genuine grief as I witnessed last Friday in Providence.

JOHN FOGARTY's constituents surely felt his loss very deeply. And, knowing JOHN as well as I did, I certainly understood why.

Mrs. Flood joins me in extending to Mrs. Fogarty and the family our heartfelt sympathy in these days of their bereavement and irreplaceable loss. I have lost a dear and true friend and this country has lost an outstanding public servant.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to extend my remarks further by inserting a letter I received from Mr. Hugh C. Murphy, Administrator, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, as well as a resolution memorializing our departed colleague which was adopted by the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship.

The aforementioned letter and resolution are herewith submitted:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP
AND TRAINING,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1967.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It was with deep sadness that the members of the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship heard of the death of Congressman Fogarty while they were in session at their quarterly meeting January 10, 1967, in Washington, D.C.

The Federal Committee on Apprenticeship is the top-level advisory committee to the Secretary of Labor on matters relating to apprenticesrip and other forms of on-the-job training, and has always been appreciative of Mr. Fogarty's interest in apprenticeship and training. The news of Mr. Fogarty's death was a shock of major proportions.

As an expression of its feelings, the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship unanimously adopted a resolution memorializing Mr. Fogarty. A copy of this resolution is enclosed.

The Committee requested that a copy of the resolution be forwarded to the Congress for insertion in the Congressional Record. It would be appreciated if you will take action to have this done.

Sincerely yours,
HUGH C. MURPHY,
Administrator.

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE LATE CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY

Resolution adopted unanimously by the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship at its 109th meeting, January 10, 1967, in Washington, D.C.:

"The Federal Committee on Apprenticeship is deeply saddened by the sudden death of John Fogarty. John Fogarty was a true friend of the working man. His selfless dedication to the improvement of working conditions, training programs, education, and the general welfare of all our citizens, young and old, endeared him to all of us who knew him or of him. His loss will be doubly felt . . . in the Congress where he served so well for 26 years and by the Federal Committee which sought and valued his counsel. He was a bricklayer by trade whose many achievements in the structure of government did not lessen or shunt aside his constant concern for the working man. We shall miss him."

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the range and quality of JOHN E. FOGARTY's public service were demonstrated by the fact that not only the newspapers of his native Rhode Island eulogized him and his achievements, but also such publications as the weekly journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the New York Times.

The weekly magazine Science said of him:

He helped create the phenomenal budgetary growth of the National Institutes of Health from $46 million in 1950 to the current sum of over $1.2 billion. Despite the budget-cutting intentions of the Eisenhower Administration and the strongly conservative makeup of the House Appropriations Committee, Fogarty repeatedly prevailed in his efforts to expand NIH's activities beyond the budget requests the administration sent to Congress . . . It is no exaggeration to say that for the past 15 years he was politically the single most important person in medical research in the United States.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, the medical columnist of the New York Times, wrote:

Medicare, Medicaid, more nursing home beds, Federal aid for the training of physicians and other health workers, the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health, workshops and classrooms for the mentally retarded and all of the other tremendous advances in health and rehabilitation in the last quarter century stand as monuments to John E. Fogarty, "Mr. Public Health."

As chairman since 1949 of what is now the House Subcommittee on Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, JOHN FOGARTY worked with unremitting zeal for the appropriations that were to make the public health programs of the United States second to none in the world.

He was born on March 23, 1913, and his formal education ended when he was graduated from high school. He became a bricklayer, and was only 23 when he was elected to the first of four 1-year terms as president of the Bricklayers Union No. 1 of Rhode Island. He was a young man of 27 when he was first elected to the House of Representatives.

Late in his second term, he enlisted in the Navy's construction corps, the Seabees. Because of his membership on the House Committee on Naval Affairs, he wanted to experience at first hand the problems of Navy enlisted men. When he returned to the House of Representatives in 1945, he said that he wanted to make himself "the enlisted man's leg man." He sought membership on the Appropriation Committee's subcommittee dealing with the naval budget, a legislative field of great importance to Rhode Island because of the Navy's many installations there. Instead of assignment to that subcommittee, however, he was placed on the subcommittee dealing with appropriations for labor, health, education, and welfare. He mastered the complexities of that subcommittee's responsibilities and became its utterly competent chairman in 1949.

He was honored time and time again for his outstanding legislative achievements. He received the Distinguished Service Award of the American Cancer Society in 1952. He received the first award made by the National Association for Retarded Children in 1956, the National Distinguished Service Medal of Parents' magazine, and the National Rehabilitation Association's annual award. In 1959, he was given a special Lasker Award for extraordinary public service by the American Public Health Association, an award usually given only to members of the medical profession.

Rich in honors, blessed with the profound admiration and affection of his colleagues and constituents, he died on the opening day of the 90th Congress. In their sorrow at his passing, the members of his bereaved family must feel a very deep and justifiable pride in the record of good works which this great man left to them as a legacy which can never die.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the loss of JOHN FOGARTY to the Congress, to the great State of Rhode Island and to the Nation has been recognized here and throughout the country in most realistic terms. It is a most unhappy occurrence to lose a man of his age who had the capacity and great desire to serve.

As a fellow member of the Appropriations Committee, I was privileged to hear him so very capably express his concern for the welfare of his fellow man, and, I must add, he was most persuasive because his concern was so obviously genuine and sincere.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family on their loss. Certainly they will always be proud of his memory because of the record that he made during his lifetime and the respect and admiration everyone had for him.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues deep sorrow at the loss of one of our most distinguished and effective Members of the House of Representatives, JOHN E. FOGARTY, who passed away on Tuesday, January 10.

JOHN FOGARTY was at the prime of his great career and had endeared himself to both Democrats and Republicans.

He was often referred to as "Mr. Public Health" because of the intense interest and wide accomplishments he achieved in all phases of our Nation's health.

Advocates of vital medical research activities recognized and honored him as their spokesman.

His outstanding record in Congress showed his great regard for his fellow man and an unusually sympathetic understanding of their needs. His legislative efforts were directed to humanitarian causes.

It will be difficult indeed to replace his expert knowledge of the Nation's health requirements, but his many achievements in this all-important field will live long after him as a tribute and memorial to this great and good legislator.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the untimely and unfortunate death of my friend and colleague, JOHN FOGARTY, has left a void in the Congress which will never be filled. The contributions he has made during his 24 years in the House to the health and welfare of the American people have enriched the lives of all of us and will continue to improve the living standards of Americans for generations to come. Almost single-handedly he prodded and goaded the Federal Government into assuming leadership in the field of public health. What a monument he leaves. Not in stone or marble—although many outstanding buildings resulted from his efforts—but in the hearts of his fellow men.

I am personally grateful to him for his many kindnesses to me and for his willingness to help a congressional neo-

phyte. When one considers the number of similar acts that he performed, one can begin to appreciate the colossal reservoir of friendship that was his.

As one whose forebears came from Ireland, he was devoted to that small, proud nation and although he never wavered in his loyalty to the United States, he was steadfast in his support of the Irish nation and in his love of the Irish people, so many of whom knew and loved him.

A proud man, a colorful man, a courageous man, a religious man, a determined man—Congressman JOHN FOGARTY would no doubt have wished to be remembered as an artisan who happened to be a U.S. Congressman. From his humble beginning, he rose to the stature of a giant among public servants. He will be missed; his legacy will not be forgotten; he cannot be replaced. Indeed, he died as he lived—serving the people.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and untimely death of our beloved colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY, will leave a great loss in the House and in the hearts of all of us who were privileged to know him. Words are inadequate to pay tribute to, or capture the essence of, a man like JOHN FOGARTY. I can say only that I shall remember him for his many kindnesses and invaluable help to me and others who serve in this body; for his courage and tenacity in the fight for medical research and everything else he believed in; for this rare gift of frankness and directness in his dealings with others; and for his strong leadership in this House and among the members of his party.

I was proud to be JOHN FOGARTY's friend, and I share with his family and multitude of friends a feeling of deep sadness and irreparable loss.

The New York Times article, "Mr. Public Health," pays recognition and high praise to JOHN FOGARTY, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

By unanimous consent, the article follows:

MR. PUBLIC HEALTH: DEATH ENDS LONG FIGHT BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY TO GIVE AMERICA FREEDOM FROM DISEASE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

If hospitals, research laboratories and institutes for the aged, infirm and retarded had flagpoles, every flag would have flown at half-staff this past week to mourn the loss of John E. Fogarty.

Representative Fogarty of Rhode Island died of a heart attack last Tuesday at the age of 53.

Flags at half-staff would not, however, been limited to institutions. They would also have been in evidence in thousands of homes throughout Rhode Island and the Nation.

Mr. Fogarty was not just interested in institutions and dollars. He was interested in people, and no appeal for help that went to his office was ever left unanswered. He would go to inordinate ends to try to find the solution to problems that were all too often insoluble.

No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

PLANNED NEW CRUSADE

Ironically, his death came just before he was to be sworn in for his 14th term—a time when he was mobilizing his forces for another all-out crusade against disease, disability and death.

Also ironically, his death was caused by a heart attack, his own personal public enemy number one as the primary killer of others.

The contribution of John Fogarty to improving health and rehabilitation services for the American people are legend.

When he entered Congress our Federal investment in medical research was but $3-million. It is now well over $1-billion.

During his freshman year in the House of Representatives, the number of disabled persons rehabilitated into employment under the public program was but 12,000. Last year it was more than 154,000.

Medicare, Medicaid, more nursing home beds, Federal aid for the training of physicians and other health workers, the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health, workshops and classrooms for the mentally retarded and all of the other tremendous advances in health and rehabilitation in the last quarter century stand as monuments to this late "Mr. Public Health."

He and his co-worker in the Senate, Senator Lister Hill from Alabama, were recognized as the great health leaders of all time. They complemented and supplemented each other in their continuing fight for the fifth freedom—freedom from disease.

STARTED AS BRICKLAYER

Mr. Fogarty's formal education ended when he received his high school diploma. He immediately followed in the footsteps of his father and older brother and became an apprentice bricklayer.

He was only 27 when he was first elected to Congress from Rhode Island. During World War II he served as an enlisted man in the Navy construction corps. After the war he returned to Congress to carry the torch for the enlisted men in the armed forces.

Having been denied a formal education and a college degree, he made possible through his untiring efforts the education of literally thousands of others as physicians, scientists and technicians because he cared.

Some years ago Mr. Fogarty was challenged with the opportunity to run for the Senate from Rhode Island. After a great deal of discussion with his friends and colleagues he decided his destiny was in the House of Representatives where he could continue his fight for health as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Health, Education and Welfare.

This was a decision that for suffering humanity was a blessed one.

John Fogarty, who started as a bricklayer, ended his career by placing countless bricks in a solid foundation of modern laboratories, medical schools, hospitals, institutions for the mentally ill and the retarded, and research laboratories that extend from the halls of science to the community itself.

With his bright green tie and his Irish accent, he was a circuit rider for health, a teacher, a preacher, a fearless foe to any challenger who stood in the way of his crusade.

He died on the field of battle. His friends from the scientist to the sick mourn his loss and call him blessed.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to serve with JOHN FOGARTY on the Committee on Appropriations, and I had many opportunities to observe at firsthand his great sense of dedication to the improvement of the human aspects of our American way of life. His interest in people and their human problems guided him at all times and urged him to take a strong stand in support of programs that were designed to better the human condition.

He was one of the most dedicated men I have known during my service in the Congress, and it may well be that this strong dedication was a contributing factor to his untimely passing. During his 26 years in the House of Representatives he had ample opportunity to assist many of his colleagues and never failed to do so. His passing leaves behind a sense of irreparable loss at this particular time when a new Congress is just in its beginning days.

I join with my colleagues here today to extend my most sincere sympathy to his family and friends. They must realize by the genuineness of the expressions here today that JOHN FOGARTY will be remembered for many years as the personification of those virtues which win the respect and admiration of the Members of this body.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY is a deep personal loss to those of us who knew him so well as one of the truly great humanitarians in this House.

As colleagues, we will miss his hard work, his straightforward honesty and his valued advice and counsel. We quickly learned to depend on JOHN FOGARTY for strength and wisdom in turning back the obstinate plagues which have incapacitated and crippled mankind and taken the very life from poor and rich alike.

JOHN FOGARTY's dedicated work to end the suffering from illness and disease, to make our world more livable and to advance the cause of mankind everywhere is an everlasting monument to his greatness.

All the people of this Nation have benefited from his relentless efforts in combating these plagues. The intensity of his work in seeking cures to the basic health problems was no doubt a factor in his untimely passing.

In returning JOHN FOGARTY to the Congress every 2 years since 1940, the people of Rhode Island acknowledged the value of his work as their Representative. His interest in the greater development of his region was well recognized. His work in behalf of the young, the poor, and the less fortunate are legend.

Lesser men would have been content to rest on their laurals after fewer accomplishments than those achieved for all mankind by JOHN FOGARTY. But he was not content as long as any task remained to be completed.

We will miss his powerful voice, his dedicated work, and his warm companionship. Our loss will be shared by all the people of this Nation.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his family at this time of their great grief.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of great personal loss that I learned of the untimely passing of our beloved friend and colleague, JOHN FOGARTY. For the past 26 years, JOHN FOGARTY served faithfully and well his constituents in this legislative body. His public service was distinguished by his amiable and friendly personality as much as it was by his great ability and skill as one of the legislative leaders of the House.

As a physician, I can personally testify to the outstanding and successful efforts of JOHN FOGARTY in working for legislation which did so much to develop

the greatest public and private health service in the world.

JOHN's entire career was a shining example of the best in American public life. He was an idealist who remained true to his ideals. He was supremely conscious of his precious heritage as an American, and he constantly strove to protect it and improve it for all of us.

We shall long miss this great American who has been called from us. I join with his host of friends in extending to his family and loved ones our most sincere condolences.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the death of our colleague, JOHN FOGARTY, on the very eve of his 14th term in the House of Representatives, is a loss, while grievous and saddening in its suddenness, will become more acute as time passes.

JOHN FOGARTY was a friend of mine. I respected him for his outstanding abilities as a lawmaker and admired him for his dedication as the chosen Representative of his people. As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations his contributions were many and in his role as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, his devotion to his duty, and his adherence to the principles of sound government were ever evident. A great Member is gone from our ranks. JOHN FOGARTY was recognized throughout this country as a leader of men and a man of public spirit. The influence of this servant of the people will be felt for many generations to come, for the efforts and example of men of his caliber are not quickly forgotten.

His many accomplishments in the Congress, fine as they were, do not eclipse the personality and character of the man himself. He was a busy man—a humble man—a good man.

My heartfelt sympathy is with the Fogarty family and it is my prayer that they will be comforted in the knowledge that JOHN FOGARTY deserves the highest tribute of all—that of a just and honorable man.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY was sincerely and firmly dedicated to the purpose of building a better and stronger America. This, I know, was manifest in many ways. I would like to speak about his dedication to the cause of education.

Texas is a long distance from Rhode Island, but when I presented the special educational problems of my district to this fine gentleman, and asked his assistance, he was entirely familiar with my problems, gave me a thorough hearing, and was able to give me the help I needed. As a young Congressman in my first term, I appreciated this assistance from one of the House veterans. I am sure many other young Congressmen have found him equally attentive to their problems, and I want to have a part in this tribute to Congressman FOGARTY's memory.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the swift passing of our beloved brother JOHN FOGARTY was a personal tragedy for his loved ones and for every Member of the House of Representatives. We all loved and admired him. His great work in the field of improving the health of our Nation will be his greatest memorial. Yet, there is no place where our country has advanced in recent years that has not felt his helping hand. We are all grateful for his leadership for our Nation and for the treasure of his friendship during his too short life.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, my sympathy is extended to the family of our late friend and colleague, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY.

Years ago while visiting in Rhode Island, I learned that the people there respected and loved JOHN FOGARTY. Later, here in the House of Representatives—on the floor and in committee—I was to know him well.

JOHN E. FOGARTY was truly a representative of the people. Humble, able and sincere, he won the respect of everyone and also helped millions of Americans in the important field of health.

His soul will rest in peace.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in their tribute to our departed colleague, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

It was not my privilege to know JOHN FOGARTY on an intimate basis, but I did admire and respect him in our joint associations on the Committee on Appropriations.

Without exception I found him friendly and understanding, considerate of opposing views and a persuasive exponent of his own position on any issue.

His humble beginnings and abbreviated education did not prevent him from achieving one of the highest offices in the land, and the respect of his colleagues for the manner in which he carried on the duties of his office.

His life story demonstrates to the world what one can accomplish in this great land of freedom if he but applies himself.

It is tragic that he should become an untimely victim of one of the dread diseases against which he led the fight and marshaled this Nation's resources. Because of his leadership in the field of medicine and medical research many millions in this and future generations will have the soundness of their bodies restored and new lives opened to them.

To the members of his family I extend deepest sympathy.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to know for only a few numbered years the late Congressman JOHN FOGARTY. This man, whose life even in memoriam casts a reflection in the best traditions of public service over the Halls of Congress, left an indelible impression by his monumental works which will outlive any of us present today.

It is indeed eminently fitting and proper that the House of Representatives should dispense with the business of the day and give these tributes of remembrance to him because he was a man to remember. JOHN FOGARTY possessed without limit a combination of the essential qualities to success: integrity, industry, and knowledge. A man of very strong integrity, a prodigious worker, and with marked intellectual ability, JOHN FOGARTY was a true public servant and a loyal American. He has helped to write page after page of history by his keenness of mind, purity of spirit, and sincere dedication to cause, tempered with his courage to face issues and the determination to voice his convictions. In the finest traditions of public service JOHN FOGARTY possessed the personal attributes of the great who have enriched the proceedings of this body before our time.

None of us shall forget that this man possessed all the qualities of a true gentleman, always dignified in mien, courtly in direction, and courteous incessantly. Neither shall we forget his wealth of knowledge which made him a scholar with penetrating depth. Remembered, too, will be his vision, his completeness, his talents, and his devotion to affairs of state, all of which caused him to place service ahead of self during his tenure in the U.S. House of Representatives.

I was fortunate enough to have the benefit of his friendship and thus to have felt the inspiring influence of his personality. Personally, I admired him and respected him deeply as a man of sound abilities with a firm and courageous dedication to principle. He furnished a paradigm for excelling in courage and completing a task. It is a sad occasion to realize the departure of one so esteemed.

Though none can ease the irreparable loss to his family, Mrs. Fogarty and his young daughter, we may only share their sorrow and say we will miss him, too.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, when I was elected to the House, one of the first men to approach me with an offer of personal assistance was the man whose memory we honor today—JOHN E. FOGARTY. While it was not my pleasure to have known him as long as many of my distinguished colleagues did, I can say unequivocally that I considered him a great friend.

That a man like JOHN FOGARTY, from humble beginnings, could rise to a position of influence in the U.S. Congress, is surely a measure of the greatness of our society. That he could maintain his humble posture throughout all those years is surely a measure of the greatness of JOHN FOGARTY.

Mr. Speaker, long before my congressional tenure began, I held an abiding interest in the problems of mental retardation. It was not until I met JOHN FOGARTY, however, that I began to appreciate the depth and the extent of this dreaded malady. JOHN FOGARTY was truly "Mr. Mental Health." Without his guidance, his perception, and his sheer tenacity, our Nation would never have come to grips with a disease which affects thousands in our society. He was the trailblazer in a very real sense, for at a time when the collective American mind was otherwise occupied, JOHN FOGARTY fought for and secured the first real meaningful national program of mental health. Nor did he stop there. Ever since that breakthrough in the fifties, JOHN FOGARTY was there in the forefront, arguing, cajoling, pleading, demanding.

As JOHN FOGARTY focused national attention on the problems of mental retardation, so also did he lead the fight

against physical maladies. His wise and judicious chairmanship of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare soon became the touchstone of congressional involvement in a variety of national medical programs: heart, cancer, and stroke research, medicare, nursing homes, nursing schools, medical laboratories, and countless others.

If JOHN FOGARTY's philosophy on health could be summed up in a sentence, I think it would sound something like this: "Any society which fails to provide for the health of its citizens is hardly worthy of the title 'civilized'."

Mr. Speaker, I will miss JOHN FOGARTY as a friend and counselor. The United States and, yes, even the world, will miss him as a leader, a battler for the little guy, a dauntless foe of disease. Where the afflicted had no strong hand, JOHN FOGARTY offered them his. Now, in the words of the ancient Gaelic blessing, may the Lord hold him in the hollow of His hand.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when the news of the sudden death of my good friend and colleague JOHN FOGARTY reached me, I was shocked and saddened that such a great loss had to be realized.

The tragic passing of Congressman FOGARTY will deprive this Nation of the services of a great and good man. Over the years we served together I learned to recognize him as a Member of this body who had a deep interest in the welfare of mankind both young and old. This brilliant, dedicated, and courageous leader built his own monument—a monument to inspire future countrymen. The Nation has lost a champion of the American way of life.

My deepest sympathy goes out to his beloved wife and daughter at this time of their great sorrow. They can treasure the rich heritage of love and affection bestowed upon them when JOHN lived, and of the mark his life will leave on the history of their great Nation. You can be even prouder that he was a fine citizen, a good father, and a thoughtful husband.

My heartfelt prayers go out to Almighty God that He grant everlasting peace to JOHN FOGARTY for which he so valiantly struggled to achieve.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will feel deeply the absence of JOHN E. FOGARTY. We will miss the friendly association with a gentle and dear colleague. We will miss his wise counsel both in the House and in the Appropriations Committee where we served together for so many years. We will miss his expert guidance on the health, education, and welfare activities of our Government. We have suffered a great loss.

Few men who serve here are able to claim the kind of accomplishment that JOHN FOGARTY leaves our Nation. The great Institutes of Health in Bethesda stand as a lasting memorial. Generations of Americans whose lives will be healthier, happier, and longer will owe a debt of gratitude to JOHN FOGARTY for his leadership in the field of health research. I hope this will be a consolation to his family and to the people of Rhode Island whom he served so ably for 26 years. I hope that all of us here today feel, as I do, a great responsibility to carry on the work of our departed friend and colleague.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened by the recent passing of our beloved colleague from Rhode Island, JOHN FOGARTY. During the short time that I have had the privilege of being a Member of Congress, I had come to know and respect JOHN for the many fine contributions he made to this great country of ours, not only in the field of health but in all matters.

His dynamic leadership in the field of improved health has left a mark and a place which will be extremely difficult to fill.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives has lost one of its able legislators with the death of JOHN E. FOGARTY. His death deprives the Second District of Rhode Island of a dedicated and hard working Representative who worked every day for 26 years for the betterment of the people he represented. His death also deprives the American people of its greatest champion for health and welfare causes.

As chairman of the Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee, JOHN FOGARTY was known throughout the world for his support of medical research. His dedication to hospitals, medical institutes, research laboratories, and his concern for the aged, infirmed and underdeveloped will almost certainly rank him among our Nation's greatest leaders in the medical field.

JOHN FOGARTY oversaw the funding of health programs in the United States longer than any Member in the history of Congress. And, it is indisputable that he has done more to advance the cause of better health and better health facilities than any other American.

His work here will live on wherever men and women work to stamp out disease, disability, and death. It is ironic that this man who did so much to prolong life should himself die so young.

Many awards, many citations, many honors, many degrees, have been conferred on JOHN FOGARTY and he has been widely respected for the astonishing progress that has been made in health and in rehabilitation through his efforts. But throughout all time, every person whose suffering is diminished, every person whose disability is eased, and every person whose life is lengthened can know that he is the beneficiary of the will and the purpose of JOHN FOGARTY.

All of us in this body know that the people of the Second District of Rhode Island has lost a Representative who was truly interested in his people. The Nation itself has lost a man who was truly interested in the common welfare of his countrymen. JOHN FOGARTY has left an indelible mark on our lives and on our times.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late distinguished Representative from Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY.

While it was only my privilege to know him during the sessions of the 89th Congress, his friendliness and kindness to others made me feel as though I had known him for many years.

The great State of Rhode Island and the Nation will suffer from the loss of such a servant in the cause of good government and humanity.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my deep regret at the passing of JOHN FOGARTY.

The sudden and untimely departure of our good friend and colleague leaves this House grieved and shocked. His understanding and generosity, his quiet leadership, and his dedication to the work of this body will long be missed.

In life, JOHN FOGARTY earned the admiration and respect of all who knew him. His efforts in behalf of medical research, his personal war to overcome the health hazards which afflict mankind earned him high and well-deserved honors.

Let the memory of his works endure to guide us.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the late Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY has earned a place in history as a pioneer and a leader in the advancement of the health standards of our Nation. Without his cooperation and encouragement, it is extremely doubtful if some of the breakthroughs in medical science could have been achieved.

For 16 years as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations JOHN FOGARTY has handled financing for the National Institutes of Health and kept abreast of the needs of medical science and of the promise held out by adequate financing. He battled at every opportunity to encourage progress in medical research.

I have lost a valued friend and adviser and medical science has lost one of its most able dedicated supporters.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, JOHN FOGARTY, our beloved friend, has left us—but not alone, for he leaves splendid memories of warmth and kindness; of labor and of love.

In his young manhood JOHN worked with his hands and learned the dignity of honest toil. In his full manhood he labored with his mind for the weak, the sick, the young, the old—in short, those who needed his help most.

Medical research and retardation have been his life's work. This wonderfully kindhearted man with ruddy, cheerful face, could be momentarily stern and then quickly turn to a winning smile and generous act.

We miss him and will always cherish his valued years with us. Knowing him, I think of his reunion with Our Creator in these words of John Clare's poem, "I Am":

I long for scenes where man has never trod;
A place where woman never smiled or wept;
There to abide with my Creator, God;
And sleep as I in childhood sweetly slept:
Untroubling and untroubled where I lie;
The grass below—above, the vaulted sky.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the profound sorrow that we feel here in the passing of our beloved colleague, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, is shared by great multitudes of citizens from coast to coast.

As chairman of that subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee providing funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he de-

voted himself to improving the health of our people.

When we consider the great medical strides that have been made during the 16 years that he has chaired his subcommittee, we must realize that he is deserving of a major credit in this great accomplishment.

Congressman FOGARTY could well be called our greatest champion of medical research.

Most certainly the medical, dental colleges, and other human welfare institutions have lost their greatest leader. It would be most fitting if some of them would dedicate some of their facilities to this great American.

Close to JOHN E. FOGARTY's heart was the improvement of educational facilities for the mentally retarded. Here, too, he originated new and effective approaches that will improve the welfare of these unfortunate children.

The legislative accomplishments of Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY were many. During his 26 years of service in this body, he attacked problem after problem. He gave freely of himself so that the people of this Nation might enjoy better health and well-being.

I feel a deep personal grief at his passing, for JOHN E. FOGARTY was my friend and I deeply cherished that friendship.

When I came to this body, 16 years ago, I searched for some guidance on education and health legislation. I found that guidance from Congressman FOGARTY. He generously gave of his valuable time to assist me in evaluating the legislative problems in these most important fields.

This Nation was enriched by the dedicated service of JOHN E. FOGARTY.

We shall long mourn the passing of this great patriot.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and tragic passing of our esteemed colleague, JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, leaves all of us with a deep sense of loss.

I was privileged to serve with JOHN FOGARTY on the Appropriations Committee for a number of years, and knew him to be an effective, dedicated worker in the public interest. He was continually striving for better medical research and was equally concerned with rehabilitation of the handicapped.

His dedication and achievements can serve as an example as we approach decisions that lie before us. In that way we can perhaps best give tribute and thereby bridge some of the gap left by this untimely loss.

To Mr. FOGARTY's wife and daughter I extend sincerest sympathies and condolences.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the loss of my good friend and colleague, JOHN FOGARTY. We served as New England Congressmen and for the last 4 years as colleagues on the Appropriations Committee.

I can only join in seconding the sentiments of my colleagues, since words are so inadequate at times of great personal loss. He was a credit to his district, his State, his country, and his principles. He leaves a gap that will not easily be filled.

His accomplishments will go down in the history of the efforts of man for mankind. There are many now alive and yet unborn whose existence was made possible by this man's determined and dedicated support of public health and education activities. There can be no finer tribute than the appreciation of millions who may not know JOHN FOGARTY by name but certainly thank him daily as they go through lives that might not otherwise be possible.

May God bless him and his accomplishments and be sure that the good work he began and nurtured will be continued.

To his lovely wife Louise and their daughter Mary, I extend the sympathies of both Mrs. Giaimo and myself.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I counted JOHN FOGARTY among my most valued friends. His passing has left me with a deep sense of personal loss—a loss which, I am sure, is shared by my colleagues. But our loss of a warm, generous friend and colleague is insignificant compared with the loss JOHN FOGARTY's death represents to the Nation.

JOHN FOGARTY was a man who believed deeply that investment in people is far more important than investment in things. Those of us who worked with him know how effective he was in championing this belief during the 25 years he served in the House and, particularly, as chairman of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

A well-known medical columnist described Chairman FOGARTY's contribution to America very well when he wrote:

> No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty. His friends—from the scientist to the sick—mourn his loss and call him blessed.

He fully deserved the title, "Mr. Public Health."

Yes, JOHN FOGARTY was a great public servant and a great humanitarian. We will miss him very much indeed.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, if it were known in hospitals, nursing homes, medical research laboratories, and clinics for the aged, the crippled, and the retarded on January 10, that JOHN E. FOGARTY has passed on, there certainly would have been universal mourning and sincere regret. Flags would have been at half-mast, there would have been memorial programs and religious observances suitable for the demise of a truly great and good man.

There was not an outpouring of national dismay, regret, and appreciation for the simple reason that millions of Americans did not know of JOHN FOGARTY and were not aware that one of the greatest benefactors, not only of his fellow Americans, but of people around the globe, had died in his congressional office. They did not know, because this humanitarian had true humility and scorned personal publicity and praise. Still, he was praised and honored, but took them only as a spur and encouragement to do more than he did.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, the emminent authority and writer in the field of medical advance and public health, commented:

> No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

It was grim irony that Mr. FOGARTY died of a heart attack, because no man did more to bring the vast resources of the Federal Government into study of the causes, prevention, and treatment of heart diseases. When he came to this House, when he was 27 years old, there was no organized, concerted Federal programs to combat heart ailments and very few and feeble projects to prevent, alleviate, or cure many of the ills that flesh is heir to.

When he came here in 1940, the Federal investment in medical research was about $3 million a year. When he died it was over $1 billion. Yet, JOHN FOGARTY knew there was more to be done, despite the enormous advances in medicine which he suggested, fostered, and encouraged. It was typical of the man that he refused opportunity to run for the U.S. Senate from his State of Rhode Island. He realized that he could do more in the House for the goal to which he was dedicated. He died on the firing line as well as any soldier, but his foe was human misery and suffering.

He began his productive years as a bricklayer and ended his career by causing more bricks and mortar to be used than any other man in our history. The hundreds of hospitals, clinics, laboratories, and institutions of study and healing everywhere the Stars and Stripes flies are monuments to JOHN E. FOGARTY.

Even greater as memorial for him is the genuine sense of loss, coupled with admiration for him in the hearts of millions ranging from the eminent scientist to a retarded child given new hope because of JOHN FOGARTY's efforts. Generations ahead will revere his name and certainly call him blessed.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, JOHN FOGARTY built a monument that any of us can view with envy and few of us can ever hope to equal—the great National Institutes of Health—dedicated to preventing the ills which kill far too many in the prime of life, or deny comfort or opportunity to hundreds of thousands of all ages.

Mankind everywhere is indebted to JOHN FOGARTY—his span of life was brief, his service great, his impact upon the future such as to insure the immortality of his name.

To his wife and family I extend my sympathy—how proud they must feel even under the burden of grief they bear.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was very shocked and saddened to learn of the sudden death of my very good friend and colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island. He was by far one of the most likeable persons I have ever known. Not only was he an outstanding public servant, proven by the record he established serving in Congress for 25 years, but he possessed a certain quality of human understanding, working hard to help his fellow man to make this a better world in which we live.

JOHN FOGARTY was a loyal friend of

mine and I shall always remember his ability; his accomplishments; his constructiveness; his noble character, and all that he stood for. His untimely passing has created a void in the 90th Congress and he will be sorely missed. However we are comforted in the knowledge that he lives in the minds and hearts of the many friends that knew him, especially those of us who were privileged to serve with him.

To his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy in this, their hour of grief.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened, as I know was each and every one of my colleagues in this House, by the death of my dear personal friend and the beloved gentleman from Rhode Island, JOHN E. FOGARTY. I am proud to have been numbered among the legion of those he called friend, and my heart goes out to the members of his family in their great loss and sorrow.

JOHN FOGARTY's outstanding record of accomplishment while serving as a Member of this body can truthfully be said to stand unchallenged as a monument to his great humanitarian concern for the suffering of his fellow man. His foresight and vision have contributed much indeed to the overall health and general welfare of all mankind. He was a man among men in the history of the public health crusade. I shall miss JOHN FOGARTY; he will be sorely missed by all of us. He was a great American and a great gentleman.

Mrs. Cahill joins me in extending to his beloved and wonderful family our deepest and sincerest sympathy.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in this well-deserved tribute to our late colleague from Rhode Island, JOHN E. FOGARTY. JOHN, certainly one of the most highly respected and capable Members of this body, will be sadly missed in the deliberations of the Congress. His 26 years of service have left his district, his State, and the Nation with an indelible imprint of outstanding public service and dedication to the public weal. His contributions to major legislation as reflected by his superlative service on the Appropriations Committee is likewise deserving of the highest praise and gratitude of all Americans.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, if one refers to the Congressional Directory—as we often do on sad occasions such as this—to find background information concerning a departed colleague, it would be of little help in the case of our beloved friend, JOHN E. FOGARTY, who has been taken from us.

For the Directory merely says this about JOHN:

JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat, of Harmony, R.I., elected in 1940; reelected to succeeding Congresses.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, those bare essentials do tell us a great deal about JOHN—perhaps more, even, than a lengthy autobiographical sketch might have done. For those words tell us, first, of his innate modesty, of his humble nature though he had risen to heights of substantial importance here in the Congress, and they tell us, too—which is perhaps the key thing that one might say of JOHN—that, to him, self was of little or no importance. What was important to JOHN FOGARTY was this House, his opportunity to serve in it, his opportunity to contribute toward the additional strength of his Nation as he, himself, viewed its needs. Sometimes, in assessing those needs or in setting the limits thereof in the always difficult task of determining relative priorities, some of us found it necessary to disagree with JOHN, but it was impossible to disagree with his goals or to question the sincerity of his dedication to them.

JOHN FOGARTY was a gentleman, a devoted servant of the people, and one of the most effective Members of this House. He worked hard, seemingly untiringly at his tasks. Perhaps he worked too hard, for it might be said he gave his life for the several causes he served—but the results of his labors are abundantly visible for all to see.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in expressing my deep sense of loss over the death of JOHN FOGARTY. I knew JOHN well, and I am sure he will be greatly missed by all of us.

JOHN FOGARTY will long be remembered for the outstanding contributions he made to our Nation, particularly in the field of health. His assistance and efforts in establishing research programs in such fields as heart disease, cancer, and other serious health problems have been of great benefit to the entire country. A great portion of his life was devoted to the field of health and for this we are extremely grateful.

The high esteem in which JOHN FOGARTY was held by his colleagues in the House of Representatives is indicative of type of outstanding individual he was. He was certainly one of the most highly respected and well thought of Members of Congress. It was with deep regret that I learned of his passing and I wish to express my deepest sympathy to his family in their great loss.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the loss of JOHN FOGARTY leaves all of his colleagues with a keen feeling of sorrow and regret. I feel a personal sense of loss at his passing and the constituents whom he so ably served have lost a dedicated legislator.

JOHN FOGARTY was always a champion of legislation to benefit his fellow human beings and he will be sadly missed in the House of Representatives. His years in the House were filled with constructive and effective service.

I join with his other friends, which are legion, in extending my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened to learn of the death Tuesday, January 10, of our good friend and able colleague, JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

Congressman FOGARTY was a great humanitarian, who provided the leadership that gave millions of his fellow countrymen the opportunity to live a fuller, richer life. He aroused the conscience of a nation to the health needs of millions of Americans, and pioneered a great health service for our country's citizens.

We in Congress will miss his presence, but the fruits of his efforts will continue to benefit Americans for many generations to come.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing deep personal regret at the sudden passing of our beloved colleague, JOHN FOGARTY.

JOHN FOGARTY was a respected veteran of the House who earned very proper recognition for his integrity, dedication to his responsibilities, and conscientious interest in the welfare of his constituents. He was the type of man that exemplifies the high caliber of public service we should expect in the Congress. This Nation and his district have lost a great public servant.

Mrs. Derwinski joins with me in extending our sympathy to Mrs. Fogarty and their daughter.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my many colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to one of the great figures of Congress in the 20th century, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

Few Americans in either public or private life have contributed more to their fellow countrymen and indeed to mankind than Congressman FOGARTY.

JOHN FOGARTY's commitment to Federal programs for health research will make a mark for many years to come.

Like my other colleagues in both the House and Senate, I count it a privilege and an honor to have served in the same Congress in which he served.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD an article by Daniel S. Greenberg in the January 13, 1967, issue of "Science" magazine, a publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Mr. Greenberg's article accurately describes Congressman FOGARTY as "a major political architect of the Federal Government's vast program of medical research."

The article follows:

REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY DIES AT 53

Representative John E. Fogarty, a major political architect of the federal government's vast program of medical research, died Tuesday at age 53 in his Capitol office, a few hours before the opening of the 90th Congress. Death was attributed to a heart attack.

Fogarty, a Rhode Island Democrat who was first elected to Congress in 1940, became chairman of the NIH appropriations subcommittee in 1949 and soon afterwards focused his career on a rapid expansion of the federal commitment to the health sciences. In alliance with his counterpart in the Senate, Lister Hill of Alabama, and NIH director James Shannon, he helped create the phenomenal budgetary growth of NIH, from $46 million in 1950 to the current sum of over $1.2 billion. Despite the budget-cutting intentions of the Eisenhower administration and the strongly conservative makeup of the House Appropriations Committee. Fogarty repeatedly prevailed in his efforts to expand NIH's activities beyond the budget requests the administration sent to Congress.

In the Senate, Hill, too, prevailed (in fact, he would even add funds beyond what Fogarty deemed useful and poltically feasible), but the Senate, generally being more liberal in financial matters, provided a more hospitable forum for NIH supporters.

The Kennedy administration restrained Fogarty, to an extent, simply by refusing to spend some of the funds he voted, and in recent years he pulled back a bit for fear of inflaming congressional suspicions toward

the rapid growth of funds for science. But the Fogarty-Hill combination never came out with any sum significantly less than the administration requested, and nine times out of ten produced a great deal more. Considering the normal practices of the House Appropriations Committee. Fogarty's performance in behalf of NIH was a personal tour de force without parallel. It is no exaggeration to say that for the past 15 years he was politically the single most important person in medical research in the United States.

Though his formal education ended with a high school diploma and he was a bricklayer by trade when elected to Congress, Fogarty possessed an incredibly deep and extensive lay knowledge of the substance of medical research. "I live this thing all year around," he once said.

One of Fogarty's most potent tactics involved his demand that NIH administrators give a "professional judgment" of their budgetary needs, and not simply a defense of the budget that emerged from pruning at the Bureau of the Budget. In 1962, for example, he paternally chided the director of the National Institute of Mental Health for defending a budget request that was only $4 million above that of the previous year. "How much do you really need?" Fogarty demanded. "I haven't figured it up," the witness said, "but I would say in total we could use somewhere between $117 million and $120 million." That was in a year when the political going was getting tough for medical research, but Fogarty granted nearly $109 million—which was $21 million more than the administration had sought.

In the late afternoon, over drinks in his Capitol office, Fogarty loved to chat about the politics and finances of NIH. During one of these sessions, toward the end of the last Congress, he said that budgetary problems and pressures for more applied research were beginning to plague NIH. "But," he said, "you can tell the scientists, nothing bad is going to happen to medical research. I'll see to that."

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, while in the course of composing an appropriate tribute to our dear friend and colleague, JOHN FOGARTY, I came across the following article in the New York Times of January 15, 1967, by Dr. Howard M. Rusk. It states so well what so many of us feel concerning the loss of this fine man that I would like to share it with Members of the House who may not already have read it. It follows:

MR. PUBLIC HEALTH—DEATH ENDS LONG FIGHT BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY TO GIVE AMERICA FREEDOM FROM DISEASE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

If hospitals, research laboratories and institutes for the aged, infirm and retarded had flagpoles, every flag would have flown at half-staff this past week to mourn the loss of John E. Fogarty.

Representative Fogarty of Rhode Island died of a heart attack last Tuesday at the age of 53.

Flags at half-staff would not, however, have been limited to institutions. They would also have been in evidence in thousands of homes throughout Rhode Island and the nation.

Mr. Fogarty was not just interested in institutions and dollars. He was interested in people, and no appeal for help that went to his office was ever left unanswered. He would go to inordinate ends to try to find the solution to problems that were all too often insoluble.

No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

PLANNED NEW CRUSADE

Ironically, his death came just before he was to be sworn in for his 14th term—a time when he was mobilizing his forces for another all-out crusade against disease, disability and death.

Also ironically, his death was caused by a heart attack, his own personal public enemy number one as the primary killer of others.

The contribution of John Fogarty to improving health and rehabilitation services for the American people are legend.

When he entered Congress our Federal investment in medical research was but $3-million. It is now well over $1-billion.

During his freshman year in the House of Representatives, the number of disabled persons rehabilitated into employment under the public program was but 12,000. Last year it was more than 154,000.

Medicare, Medicaid, more nursing home beds, Federal aid for the training of physicians and other health workers, the clinical center of the National Institutes of of Health, workshops and classrooms for the mentally retarded and all of the other tremendous advances in health and rehabilitation in the last quarter century stand as monuments to this late "Mr. Public Health."

He and his co-worker in the Senate, Senator Lister Hill from Alabama, were recognized as the great health leaders of all time. They complemented and supplemented each other in their continuing fight for the fifth freedom—freedom from disease.

STARTED AS BRICKLAYER

Mr. Fogarty's formal education ended when he received his high school diploma. He immediately followed in the footsteps of his father and older brother and became an apprentice bricklayer.

He was only 27 when he was first elected to Congress from Rhode Island. During World War II he served as an enlisted man in the Navy construction corps. After the war he returned to Congress to carry the torch for the enlisted men in the armed forces.

Having been denied a formal education and a college degree, he made possible through his untiring efforts the education of literally thousands of others as physicians, scientists and technicians because he cared.

Some years ago Mr. Fogarty was challenged with the opportunity to run for the Senate from Rhode Island. After a great deal of discussion with his friends and colleagues he decided his destiny was in the House of Representatives where he could continue his fight for health as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

This was a decision that for suffering humanity was a blessed one.

John Fogarty, who started as a bricklayer, ended his career by placing countless bricks in a solid foundation of modern laboratories, medical schools, hospitals, institutions for the mentally ill and the retarded, and research laboratories that extend from the halls of science to the community itself.

With his bright green tie and his Irish accent, he was a circuit rider for health, a teacher, a preacher, a fearless foe to any challenger who stood in the way of his crusade.

He died on the field of battle. His friends from the scientist to the sick mourn his loss and call him blessed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to express my personal sadness at the passing of Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY from the congressional scene. Though I served in the Congress with him for only 1 year, during the second session of the 89th Congress, prior to that my predecessor and father, the late Representative Clarence J. Brown and Representative FOGARTY served almost concurrently during the latter's 26-year tenure.

It was to Congressman FOGARTY that my father expressed his interest concerning research in the health fields in which both were so interested.

My father particularly sought Congressman FOGARTY's aid in connection with leukemia research at the National Institutes of Health and Children's Hospital in Columbus, Ohio, and at other locations throughout the Nation. His interest was stimulated by the illness of his granddaughter, Elizabeth Ellen Brown, my own child, who suffered from leukemia from April 1961 until her death in March of 1964.

Mr. FOGARTY's interest in her progress and illness was expressed on many occasions. His sympathy and understanding for those ravished by this and other tragic diseases were undoubtedly responsible for his efforts to see the Federal Government take an active lead in stimulating research aimed at conquering these diseases.

History may see his name and accomplishments fade, as do the names and deeds of so many great men who cross the stage of time. But to those who knew him, and those who did not, and particularly to the Lord in Heaven who loves us all, he can have no greater memorial than his sincere effort to reduce the suffering of mankind.

The children who will not suffer from leukemia when that disease is finally conquered will provide a testimony to him. He will rest well.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored at the prospect, but saddened by the thought, of joining the gentleman from Rhode Island and my other distinguished colleagues in paying respects to one who was reelected to this Congress but who was taken from our midst shortly prior to the convening of the 90th Congress.

The death last week of JOHN E. FOGARTY left a void in this great body and his passing leaves a void in the hearts of all who knew him. For 13 terms, over a quarter of a century, he rendered distinguished service to his consitituency, to his great State and to the Nation, for his representation extended beyond the Second District of Rhode Island.

I was indeed grateful for his kindness, his thoughtfulness, his counsel, and his assistance on many matters of importance to me and my constituency. He gave of himself willingly and freely. I was one of the beneficiaries of his boundless kindness, as are all who had the privilege of knowing him.

Rhode Island has lost a great statesman and a great Congressman. We here have lost a great friend.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAINE] has very eloquently paid tribute to our fallen colleague, Representative JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY. He and the others who have preceded me have very properly emphasized the service of JOHN FOGARTY to humanity through his zeal for a more healthful America.

A man's work can be accurately gaged by his concern for his fellow man. No man has ever had a greater concern for his fellow man than JOHN FOGARTY. His concern was accompanied by action which will result in incalculable benefit to mankind throughout our future history.

All of us admired our late colleague. All of us appreciated the warmth of his personality and the loyalty which he displayed toward so many of us and to all worthwhile causes to which he gave his name and effort. Millions will have an appreciation for the results of his work even though they may never be aware of the name of the architect.

JOHN FOGARTY has now left this earthly scene but his works will last as long as human beings inhabit the earth. For a man who has wrought so well there can be no adequate expression of appreciation for his life and the sense of loss which we have in his passing.

Mrs. Whitener joins me in extending to the family of JOHN FOGARTY our sentiments of deepest sympathy in the loss which they so keenly feel.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of my good friend JOHN E. FOGARTY, the House of Representatives loses one of its most valuable and respected Members. Members may have disagreed with JOHN FOGARTY from time to time, but no one ever doubted his integrity, his sincerity, and his absolute devotion to his country and to the Congress of the United States.

I presume that JOHN FOGARTY would have classed himself as a liberal in accordance with its present definition. Yet I can say without fear of contradiction that he was a liberal who was respected by conservatives, because he was absolutely sincere in his beliefs, and held them without expectation of gain or approbation. He believed that way because his conscience told him to, and such a man is worthy of the respect of anyone.

Congressman FOGARTY's principal line of congressional endeavor was as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare of the Committee on Appropriations. I doubt that he was ever completely satisfied at the pace at which research and development in the medical arts was progressing. In many instances, under both Republican and Democrat administrations, Mr. FOGARTY's subcommittee recommended the appropriation of funds for research in various phases of the healing arts over and above the sums provided in the budget. This was caused by JOHN FOGARTY's great devotion to healing, and to the welfare of his fellow man.

JOHN FOGARTY's passing is a loss to his State and district, as well as to the entire Nation. I join with my colleagues in expressing sympathy to Mr. FOGARTY's family and to his constituents, at this great loss.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep sorrow at the loss of my friend and fellow member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY.

JOHN was a truly dedicated public servant who served not only his constituency but all the people of the United States. It was a privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations and he will be sorely missed.

JOHN FOGARTY has a living memorial through his contributions and leadership in the field of aid to the physically handicapped, to the mentally retarded, and in all areas of medical research.

We have all lost a great friend, an able legislator, and a statement. Mrs. Addabbo joins me in extending our deepest sympathy and condolences to Mrs. Fogarty and the other members of the family in their bereavement.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues and his legion of friends and admirers throughout the country to honor the memory of my friend and distinguished statesman from the great State of Rhode Island, the late JOHN FOGARTY. His tragic and untimely passing is a great loss to the Congress, to the people of his district and State, and to all the people of the United States for his interest was in their interest and his life was in their service.

As one of his junior colleagues on the Appropriations Committee of this House it was my great privilege to work with JOHN and to observe his devotion to the tremendously important cause of public health and rehabilitation. His efforts in helping to broaden the educational opportunities for thousands of Americans in diverse fields of endeavor resulted year in and year out in additional funds that were of immeasurable assistance in developing a stronger America. As chairman of the important Subcommittee of Appropriations for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, his work deserves the appreciation of everyone throughout the land regardless of political party.

My heart goes out in sympathy to his family and relatives for the good Lord called him far too early. With them in profound sorrow stand all of us, his friends and colleagues. He was a great American.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in 1940, when JOHN E. FOGARTY came to the House, a young and energetic man, we did not have an inkling that this man would some day bring all his vigor, his enthusiasm, his foresight, and his dedication to insure for the people of the United States research and progress in the health of the Nation. JOHN's name will forever be associated with the accomplishments of the National Institutes of Health. So thoroughly did he understand the significance of pure research that even now we cannot foresee what benefits will flow to mankind because JOHN FOGARTY cared. It is sad indeed to know that this man, who spent so much of his life to prolong life for others, should have died at the height of his powers.

I watched him grow in parliamentary finesse throughout the years, and in power as he chaired the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare. Withal, his modesty, his refusal to seek the limelight, were known to all of us who had reason to call him friend. He has more than justified his life, short as it was. We can, in fact and in truth, say that his living has enriched the Nation and even the world.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound shock that we learned on the opening day of this Congress that our close friend and colleague, JOHN FOGARTY, had been fatally stricken in his Capitol Hill office—stricken as he continued his diligent work in behalf of his constituents and the entire Nation.

It is particularly difficult to lose a colleague with whom you have served on committee for so many years. It was my privilege to have served with JOHN on the Appropriations Committee, and recall his many words of wisdom and encouragement when I first became a member of that committee. I am forever in his debt.

Much has already been said, here in this House and in the press, of JOHN FOGARTY's work in medical research and public health. Our Nation is healthier because of his efforts. His outstanding works will long live as a monument to his effectiveness as a lawmaker and sincere humanitarian. No monument is so enduring as the gratitude of the people who have benefited substantially from a great man's efforts.

Integrity, diligence, effectiveness, faithfulness—all words that describe JOHN FOGARTY. But words cannot alone express the feelings we have in our hearts when a trusted friend leaves our midst.

To the family and friends of JOHN FOGARTY, I can but simply say that I share your deep sense of loss.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, all of us were profoundly shocked on the opening day of this session by the sudden death of our friend and colleague, JOHN FOGARTY.

JOHN was a remarkable man whose 26 years in Congress and whose many and great achievements belied his comparative youth. We who served with him on the Appropriations Committee held him in warm esteem for his dedication to the cause of medical science.

JOHN was known as a "circuit rider of health," and his endeavors in behalf of modern research laboratories, medical schools, hospitals and institutions for the mentally ill and retarded took him on speaking engagements from one end of the Nation to the other. Only a few days before he died, I telegraphed him greetings when he spoke in my home city, Cleveland, Ohio. As irony would have it the group he addressed is named "The Live Long and Like It Club."

Undoubtedly the strenuous schedule he kept in meeting the countless demands on his time hastened his untimely passing. His acomplishments are a part of the national scene and the contributions he made to the Nation's health are incalculable.

We on both sides of the aisle will miss him, as a congenial friend and as a fearless fighter for the country's sick and suffering.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues here in the Congress in paying tribute to our late friend and distinguished Member, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY. The joy that all of us might have felt on January 10 of this year when the new Congress was sworn

in was struck a devastating blow when we learned that JOHN had died here on Capitol Hill that very morning. We have all suffered a great loss in the death of JOHN FOGARTY. His long record of service here in the Congress is ample witness to the esteem in which he was held by his own constituents, who kept him here in Congress serving them for so many years. The esteem in which he was held by his colleagues will be reflected in the numerous remarks from the floor of the House today. As one who served with Mr. FOGARTY on the Appropriations Committee, I can give my own personal testimony as to the esteem in which all of us on the committee held him. He spent 26 years of his life serving the people of Rhode Island and the Nation. Those 26 years saw some of the most significant work in the history of the American Congress. His part in that work will always be remembered and will make his name one that will forever be a source of pride to the people of Rhode Island, to his wife, and to his beloved daughter. The whole Nation will miss this fine man.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the Halls of Congress are more lonely without JOHN FOGARTY. JOHN's contributions are well noted in our records. Our Nation's health was his major concern. Not one of us can match his record in this field. The magnificent progress in health and research has resulted in great measure from the determination and courage of JOHN FOGARTY. Medical schools, universities, hospitals for hundreds of years to come will remember his efforts and accomplishments.

Yes, these Halls are more lonely, but although his voice has been stilled, the memory of our colleague's convictions and contributions, his courageous fight for the betterment of mankind will live with us. His dedication and service will be an inspiration for all of us to emulate and achieve.

To his wife and daughter goes my deepest sympathy. I am sorry for all of us—for his fellow Congressmen and for the Nation. Yes—our Halls are more lonely—there is a vacant chair where JOHN FOGARTY sat—a chair which can never be filled.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I join today with the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] in paying tribute to my wonderful friend and colleague, the late JOHN FOGARTY.

One of the greatest blessings of serving as a Member of this Congress is the new friends that you acquire from among your colleagues, and JOHN FOGARTY was one of these blessings, for I was proud to be able to call him my friend.

JOHN was truly an outstanding example of what can be accomplished under our great American system, and his life story could be easily used to spur our young people on for greater achievements in their own life.

Only in America can a man rise from the ranks with a very limited education to become one of the most powerful in the most powerful legislative bodies in the world. Such is the story of JOHN FOGARTY, for he earned this pinnacle of success not as done in other countries, by force of arms, by threats, or by fear, but he reached his heights by earning the respect of his fellow man, and in return giving his utmost to make life easier and more enjoyable for the people, not only of this Nation but of the world.

Certainly there is a monument to his memory at his resting place in his beloved State of Rhode Island, but there are also monuments of JOHN FOGARTY throughout our Nation. Some of these monuments are in stone and steel, in the form of medical centers and research institutes, which JOHN FOGARTY helped to build, just as if he had participated in his original trade as a bricklayer. There are also living monuments such as those people who now have a little longer lifespan, or those who are able to walk a little straighter, or those who can go through the day without pain, due to the efforts and leadership of JOHN FOGARTY in promoting the advancement of medical science.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, not only we here on the floor of the House have lost a friend, but the millions of Americans, even those who may not know the name of JOHN FOGARTY, have lost a friend.

To his wife and daughter, as well as the other members of his family, I express my deepest sympathy, but I trust that they may gain some comfort from the knowledge that JOHN FOGARTY was not only appreciated by those of us who knew him, but will also be missed by those of us who enjoyed his companionship.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, with a heavy heart and a sense of deep loss that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding Member of Congress, a great American and a true humanitarian, our late beloved colleague, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

Millions of Americans today are living healthier, better lives because of the major achievements of JOHN FOGARTY's career in this legislative body. Many more millions of our country will, in the future, reap the benefits of JOHN FOGARTY's dedication to the cause of health and medical research.

In JOHN FOGARTY, as in few other men, the promise and the fulfillment of our democratic society met. His life and works justify the profound belief on which this country is built, that in a free society true quality and talent will inevitably rise to the top.

He was not a man born into wealth and high position. His parents were poor, his education was modest.

Yet his natural qualities of leadership, his deep compassion and his great vision found fertile soil in our democratic society. As he grew mentally and spiritually, the people of his native State recognized his qualities and when he was but 27 years old, elected him as their Representative in Congress.

With the outbreak of World War II, he joined the Navy and served as an enlisted man. This experience affected him deeply and he returned determined to be a voice for the enlisted man in these Chambers.

His voice and his counsel were prominent in the formation of much important legislation affecting our returned GI's. JOHN FOGARTY was determined that the men he served among would have many of the educational and other advantages which he had been denied.

Then 12 years ago this fast-rising Congressman had his first heart attack. It may have been providential, since it launched him on a career of fighting that dreaded scourge of man—disease.

JOHN FOGARTY was a determined foe. He became well informed on medicine and medical problems. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, he used the power of the pursestrings to foster medical education and research.

For example, when he entered Congress in 1940, our Government's annual investment in the health of Americans was but $3 million. It is now well over $1 billion yearly.

In 1940, the number of disabled persons rehabilitated into employment under public auspices was about 12,000. Last year it was more than 154,000.

Because of JOHN FOGARTY, our Nation has increased the quantity and improved the quality of our hospitals, doctors, medical technicians, scientists, rehabilitative centers, therapists, and dentists.

Of him Dr. Howard Rusk, medical editor of the New York Times, has said:

> No one in the history of the country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

And Rodale's Health Bulletin said:

> Mr. Fogarty decided to study the health legislation field and he achieved an expertise unique in the Congress. He was the key man in all health legislation financing.

From far and wide have come the testimonials to this great man and humanitarian. Although he moved in the power circles of his country, although he was acclaimed and respected by the cream of America's medical and scientific talent, JOHN FOGARTY never lost touch with the people.

His heart and soul were too big for that. He truly cared about individuals, particularly the sick and suffering. He saw them both as persons and as elements of a larger society which could provide facilities and knowledge to cure and heal.

Although JOHN FOGARTY has passed from us, his rich legacy remains. We who are left behind must see to it that the work which he started is carried on. Our Nation must not flag in the combat against disease. Cancer, stroke, and the heart disease which finally claimed JOHN FOGARTY's life must be conquered.

Through the level of our appropriations for these purposes, we shall have a say in how soon the riddles of those killer diseases are solved. We must make it sooner, rather than later. JOHN FOGARTY would want it that way.

My wife joins me in an expression of deepest sympathy to Mrs. Fogarty and their daughter. Our consolation is that a life such as his must surely find its reward beyond.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, when JOHN FOGARTY died I lost a close personal friend and a valued senior adviser.

The people of the United States lost a great champion.

His interest in the welfare of people, whether it be in the field of health research, whether it be in the education of our young people, whether it be in the problems of older Americans, or whether it be in the very soul of America, is well memorialized in the programs undertaken by the Federal Government that have had such impact upon each and every one of us.

I stand here today with a clean bill of health from a battery of doctors because of the skills and techniques developed by the heart research that JOHN FOGARTY nourished from his position on the Appriations Committee.

It will be one of the ironies of history that this great man fell victim, in the prime of his life, to a heart attack, when so many others have had, and will have, their life spans extended as a result of his work.

Mr. Speaker, in 1955 when I first came to this body, JOHN FOGARTY was one of the first of my senior colleagues I had the opportunity to meet. Fortunately for me, we seemed to have an affinity for each other. He, the youthful veteran of the legislative process, spent many hours with me; explaining, advising, and guiding. Out of this virtual teacher-pupil relationship grew a warm personal friendship which the years served only to solidify. We became frequent luncheon companions.

As a matter of fact, Mrs. Thompson, who shared my admiration and affection for JOHN FOGARTY, and I were scheduled to lunch with him on January 10.

At his request, for the past several years it has been my privilege and honor to preside over the House when the Labor-HEW appropriations bill was under consideration.

We shared many common legislative interests, and many of the programs he espoused came before the Committee on Education and Labor. Of course his subcommittee funded most of our programs. He and I jointly sponsored many bills in the fields of the arts and the humanities, predecessors to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, established by the 89th Congress.

The impact of JOHN FOGARTY'S service in the House of Representatives will be felt by Americans of all ages, in all walks of life, and in every way, for generations to come.

I have lost a friend. We have all lost a respected and valued colleague.

To his wife, Luise, and his daughter, Mary, Mrs. Thompson and I extend our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague and friend, JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, will be missed by the Members of this body, by his constituents whom he so ably represented, and by the host of people throughout the Nation concerned with or interested in the problems of public health.

Over the years he has become identified with the expanding health programs of the Federal Government. Those who deal in health programs in the Federal Government, in State and local governments, the professional people in all of the health fields and the public in general have come to think of JOHN E. FOGARTY as the outstanding proponent and champion of better health care for all citizens. He is thought of as the builder of that great and growing complex, the National Institutes of Health.

His reputation is well earned. He should be remembered for all time as a champion of the afflicted, the relentless foe of disease and pain. Conscientious and tireless in his efforts, he promoted research into the causes and the cures for the many killers which attack mankind. The marvelous progress which has been made can be attributed to a great degree to this fine man. The long and arduous efforts of JOHN FOGARTY in behalf of all men and his feeling of urgency that more should be done no doubt contributed to his own untimely demise, a victim of one of his sworn enemies, heart disease.

The efforts which he made in this great crusade will not be wasted. He has made his mark, and the work which has been done is now recognized as only a start. We will always know that were he here to counsel us and spur us on, he would say, "More effort, move faster, mankind cannot wait while we quibble."

Despite all that remains to be done—and in the case of health research and health programs it can never be done—JOHN FOGARTY can leave us with a feeling of deep satisfaction that his life and his efforts have benefited every American in the most direct and personal manner. It is a monument which can never crumble or be cast aside. As long as man struggles for the peak and strives to know more and use his knowledge to alleviate suffering and improve the world in which we live, JOHN E. FOGARTY will be remembered with respect and admiration.

I consider it an honor to have worked with JOHN FOGARTY and to have the privilege of noting some of his many accomplishments here on the floor of the House of Representatives where his work was done and where the memory of his being and his doing will linger long in the hearts of his colleagues and his successors.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we have suffered an awesome loss with the death of our beloved colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY. There is now an aching void which is meaningful not alone to those who were fortunate to be his friend and colleague, but as well to the millions who benefited directly from his wise advocacy and forceful leadership in the House.

His constituency transcended his own district. For in truth millions were, and will continue to be, restored to health as a result of the magnificent research, training, and construction programs he brought into being. Children will receive more, and better, education through programs nurtured by JOHN'S dedication, interest and skill. And there is now hope for a productive and happy future for mentally retarded children because of JOHN'S compassion and determination.

Nor did he ever neglect his own identification with the American workingman. He fought constantly for the implementation of improved wages and working conditions.

We served with him and we reacted to his enthusiasms. He could not permit this House to be deluded by false economies. For JOHN FOGARTY, programs were judged first by the criteria of value and need. Once these were established, he fought for the dollars to realize the values and to meet the needs.

Because of him we take pride in our outstanding progress toward achieving the highest health and educational standards in the world.

We will sorely miss JOHN FOGARTY. But his legacy to us, and to the country, will reach far into the future, for the benefit and welfare of all Americans.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal sorrow that I join with my colleagues here in this preeminently merited tribute to one of the greatest legislators ever to serve in this body, the late Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY of Rhode Island.

Through 26 years of dedicated duty, interrupted only for World War II military service, JOHN FOGARTY, by sheer integrity of character, determination of will, and persevering diligence, steadily advanced to the heights of public responsibility and public regard, particularly because of unmatched knowledge and leadership in the technical legislative area of national health needs which was the special interest of the Appropriations Subcommittee he chaired over the past 16 years. We do not exaggerate in saying that no other individual knew as much as JOHN FOGARTY about the foundation and superstructure of what we may call the basic, living humanities.

Certainly no individual ever exercised his authority and applied his knowledge for the benefit of his country and his fellow men with greater courage, more generous heart, more genial nature, more inspiring spirit, more unselfish humility or more understanding sympathy and encouragement than Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY.

All of us in this House, privileged to serve with him, have long esteemed him in our judgment, in our friendship and in our warmest admiration as a practicing, learned director and dispenser of humanities in all his official and personal activities.

This country and this House will sorely miss him, but JOHN FOGARTY'S unique record of honorable public service insures that his name will forever be enshrined in the brightest pages of humane accomplishment in the legislative history of this Nation and his life will remain always as an inspiring example to those of us now here and those who will come after us.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we all join in expressing heartfelt sympathy in their great loss to JOHN'S courageous, gracious wife, Luise, and his wonderful daughter, Mary, while we unite in our prayers for the repose of the soul of our departed, beloved colleague.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the House and each one of us as individuals has suffered a great loss with the passing of JOHN FOGARTY. Truly, he was one of the most able and distinguished Members with whom I have had the privilege of serving.

JOHN FOGARTY justly earned the title of

"Mr. Public Health" for his many efforts in advancing the public health resources of our Nation. But his contributions in education were also substantial and neither working men and women nor the older people of this country will soon forget the battles he fought for them.

In many ways, JOHN FOGARTY epitomized the American dream. From the most humble beginnings he rose to the chairmanship of one of the most important subcommittees of the Congress. As throughout his 26 years of service in the House, his work as chairman was characterized by ability, dedication, and conscience.

Mr. Speaker, I join in mourning the loss of this great and good man, and Mrs. Cohelan and I wish to express to all members of the Fogarty family our heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathy.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the moving tributes paid here today by our distinguished colleagues bear witness to the membership's genuine sorrow and sense of loss at the untimely passing of the beloved JOHN E. FOGARTY.

His superb record of accomplishment to advance the health and welfare of our people earned Congressman FOGARTY a lasting place in history. Generations yet unborn will benefit from his untiring efforts to promote medical research and to make available the miracles of modern medicine to people everywhere.

Congressman FOGARTY's warm and affable nature cloaked a crusading spirit determined to give Americans the opportunity to live healthier and richer lives. He will be sorely missed by his constituents, his colleagues in the Congress, and his fellow citizens. As we mourn him, let us resolve to carry forward with his zeal the great goals to which JOHN FOGARTY dedicated himself.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, our beloved friend and associate.

We shall sorely miss his presence and counsel in the months and years ahead. He was a dedicated legislator, a compassionate and loyal friend, who understood government and directed his efforts throughout to the health and well-being of the people of Rhode Island and the Nation at large.

His contribution to the field of health research and health services will long be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, good government is not something that flows inherently from the institutions created by our constitution and our laws. These are but the framework, and it is ultimately the people's representatives who must guide the affairs of the Nation and instill a sense of purpose and integrity in the system.

JOHN FOGARTY represented the very best tradition in democratic government. He served his constituency, and the Nation's interest, with a calm and perceptive resourcefulness which is the crucial determinant of a government always searching and probing and always keyed to the needs of the people.

I know that JOHN FOGARTY's many achievements throughout his tenure will give us faith and vision to pursue our duties in this Chamber.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, blessed always will be the name of JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY. All the world and generations to come, he served in a measure unsurpassed. My life has been enriched by knowing him and having him as a close and beloved friend. In this historic Chamber, to which he gave a glowing warmth, there will long be felt a chilling void by all the Members. To his loved ones, I extend my deepest sympathy.

No man in history has done more than JOHN FOGARTY in organizing and directing the forces of civilization in a massive attack upon killing and crippling diseases which take appalling toll. The keynote of his public life was his determination to conquer disease and thus promote good will among men. He marshaled his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee in his crusade against disease and his driving arguments in debate won victory after victory for bills furnishing the money for the world's greatest health programs. He promoted international health research, believing that, in the exchange of scientific knowledge, international good will would supplant international wars. Man, he believed, must give up war to wage an international war upon disease.

JOHN FOGARTY's crusade to promote the welfare of humanity through the elimination of pain and suffering began with the diseases and illnesses of childhood and progressed through legislation for the creation of a Federal Commission on Aging.

It is almost ironical that JOHN FOGARTY introduced a resolution authorizing the President of the United States to issue an annual proclamation designating February as American Heart Month. At the peak of a brilliant career, the health enemy which he had designated No. 1—heart disease—struck him down.

JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY was both humble and sincere. I never knew a man with a kinder heart. He had a keen intellect and was a hard worker. He was one of the few men in American history who declined a seat in the U.S. Senate offered him on a golden platter. He chose to remain in the House continuing his great work as the arch enemy of heart and other crippling ailments.

We were indeed fortunate that JOHN FOGARTY came our way.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with all the events of the past week, it is only in recent days that I have really begun to realize the truly great loss we have suffered by the sudden, tragic death of our distinguished colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY. The impact and the magnitude of this loss will be felt for many years to come, not only by his family, close friends and colleagues, but by the people of this country.

We have all lost a champion and a great fighter for the betterment of the education and welfare of all our citizens.

Of the many thousands of words of eulogy, I have read one particular statement that to me more truly exemplified JOHN FOGARTY than any other:

> The gap between the modesty of his background and the breadth of his achievement was matched by a gap between the modesty of his self appraisal and the praise that he received in life and death.

In the many words written and spoken about the achievements of JOHN FOGARTY, much emphasis has been made of his championship and accomplishment in the field of medical legislation and heart research. But little emphasis has been placed on his equally great and important achievements in the field of education—his fight for improved educational opportunity for all people at all levels of society, often standing against the would-be budget cutters and the administration itself in his efforts to extend and improve our educational programs.

I know that without his determined efforts, in the face of great opposition, we would have been unable to expand and improve our public library services—a keystone to the education, cultural enrichment, and betterment of people of all ages.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the greatest tribute that we in Congress can pay to our fallen colleague is to pick up the cudgels and carry on his fight for the worthwhile causes and the dreams he believed in and devoted his life to.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief because words cannot describe the loss which I feel—the loss which all of us here feel—with the death of a beloved friend, JOHN FOGARTY. What a splendid individual and what a great Member of Congress was this JOHN FOGARTY. No man was ever more ready to lend a hand, to help a friend or a stranger. And what great pride—pride in his Irish ancestry, pride in the hands with which he worked, pride in his family and those he loved and pride in himself.

This House reflects the courage and dedication of many great Americans who have served here. None have been more dedicated or more courageous or more wonderful than JOHN FOGARTY.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues here today in expressing our grief at the loss of one who was so well loved and held in such high esteem by all of us.

JOHN E. FOGARTY was a dedicated and devoted public servant, a man who had vision, promise, and determination, and the ability and talent to bring to fruition the hopes and dreams of not only his own generation, but those which follow.

I was privileged to serve in this House with JOHN FOGARTY for but a few short years, but in that span of time I came to know of his warm regard for his fellow man, and his burning desire to further the cause of humanity. He was a strong but gentle man, a true friend, and an inspiration to all who knew him.

His major achievements in the fields of health and education stand as a lasting tribute to an effective Member of the Congress whose memory we shall always cherish. I sorrow that he will no longer be with us to give us the benefit of his understanding, his forthright and honest convictions, and steadfast courage.

My deepest sympathies go out to his wife and daughter, and my prayers go with him.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in expressing sympathy to the family of

JOHN E. FOGARTY in their loss and to the loss suffered by his district and his Nation. While I had the privilege of knowing JOHN only for a brief period of time, I learned quickly that he was a man of great dedication, a legislator of untold capacity to accomplish his task, and a man of loyalty not only to his district but to his Nation.

And so, I join not only in expressing sympathy to his loved ones left behind, but I join the people of our Nation in mourning the loss of a great citizen, an outstanding patriot, and an able and dedicated Member of this body.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I share the deep sorrow that shrouds this Chamber today. But I rise gladly to pay tribute to a colleague who was such a humanitarian as was JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

We know well his dedication to the promotion of public health and his energetic crusading against the diseases which threaten sound bodies and sound minds. We know well his untiring efforts to establish and improve health services, facilities, and centers of research.

I knew JOHN FOGARTY as a close friend and confidant. Our first meeting came almost to the day I was first seated in this Chamber, August 6, 1963. From that day until JOHN FOGARTY collapsed in his House office, only hours before we Members of the 90th Congress were administered the oath of office, he was ever willing to advise and counsel.

His loss is a tragic one to his family, his friends, his Nation. His loss is a tragic one to me.

During the 89th Congress I introduced a bill to establish a National Eye Research Institute where this Nation's talents and energies could be focused on combating the dread diseases which take away sight and plunge humans into a world of darkness. As the idea for such an institute began to emerge in the form of a bill, it was to this man I frequently turned for direction. I have reintroduced this bill in the 90th Congress, and I now dedicate my energies to see this bill enacted to the memory of JOHN FOGARTY.

Certainly no other man among us, nor of this century, has given greater devotion to the development and preservation of the public health. No other man has experienced greater achievement in so many humanitarian causes. He fully deserved the title "Mr. Public Health" bestowed upon him this week in the columns of the New York Times.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing sorrow for the untimely passing of our colleague, JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY, of Rhode Island. There is no need to explain here that the Nation has lost a diligent and effective public servant—a man who sought and obtained support for medical research into so many of mankind's illnesses, including the very illness which took him from us on the eve of his swearing in for his 14th term as a Member of this House.

We can only take comfort from the fact that JOHN FOGARTY's part in promoting research into a wide range of human ills has saved uncounted thousands of lives the world around, though he himself was not spared. As is so often true, most of these fortunate persons will never know the service he did them.

I will not attempt here to list the long, long record of awards JOHN FOGARTY won in his 26 years of service in the House nor the many facets of his character which endeared him to us. I would simply say that he was an example of how any of us can achieve great service to our country through personal diligence and unity of purpose.

Mr. Speaker, can any of us aspire to a higher title than the informal one by which Mr. FOGARTY was known: "Champion of Better Health for the Nation"? We will miss him in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, we, the Congress, and the country have lost a loyal, devoted legislator and friend with the passing of our esteemed colleague, JOHN FOGARTY. I was honored to have served with him for over 20 years in Congress so I know firsthand the loss that we all suffer as we sadly salute the memory of a valued friend. His strength and Irish wit will long be remembered by all of us.

Thousands of families across the Nation grieve especially for the loss of a real fighter for mental health. It is safe to say few men waged a tougher battle to improve and assist the mentally retarded than the one fought by JOHN FOGARTY. And he won and won big. No wonder he is affectionately referred to as the "Champion of Better Health for the Nation." Since he was one of the most knowledgeable men in the Nation on health affairs, we are all deeply indebted to this great humanitarian.

A quiet, modest, and kindly man, JOHN FOGARTY was both persuasive and powerful in his participation in debate. A gentleman in the finest and broadest sense of the word, JOHN FOGARTY started as a bricklayer and never stopped building. His last breath was drawn busy at his desk perfecting plans as the legislative architect in building a stronger health program for the Nation. His contributions are truly lasting ones, and many are the legislative monuments that will long stand because they have been mortared together by the skillful hands of this great and proud Irishman.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the late JOHN E. FOGARTY was a man who spent his entire life fighting on behalf of the sick and the infirm.

His constituency was not restricted to his district in Rhode Island. Suffering humanity anywhere was his constituency also.

JOHN FOGARTY was a man whom I respected and admired profoundly as a colleague—but he was likewise a man whom I was proud to call my personal friend.

I had the honor several years ago of having him as a guest in my home and his personal charm captivated my family as his persuasiveness often was so convincing to his colleagues on the floor of the House.

JOHN FOGARTY had many talents, but his finest trait was his love for people—and particularly for the old, the sick, and the infirm.

I think that the distinguished medical editor of the New York Times, Howard Rusk, M.D., summed up JOHN FOGARTY's contribution to his fellow man when he wrote:

> No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative FOGARTY.

There's no question about it: JOHN FOGARTY was an outstanding American and he will be sorely missed by those for whom he gave so much.

I have rarely known a more dedicated colleague than JOHN FOGARTY. And there have been few men I have been prouder to call my friend.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad occasion today as we pay tribute to our departed colleague, the late JOHN E. FOGARTY. His tragic death at the relatively young age of 53 was a personal shock to me, and it was a deep loss for the United States, for this Congress, and for the people of the Second Congressional District of Rhode Island.

It was my honor and privilege to serve with JOHN FOGARTY in the 89th Congress. During that 2 years, I came to hold him in great admiration and respect. He was a man who truly cared about people. He showed this in many ways, but particularly in his work as chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with labor, health, education, and welfare.

JOHN FOGARTY truly earned his unofficial title as "Mr. Public Health." For many years he was an ardent and active advocate of medicare, medical research and training, hospital grants, and rehabilitation programs.

JOHN FOGARTY was originally a bricklayer, and was a dedicated unionist all of his life. He won election to the presidency of his union at the age of 23, and was reelected to three additional terms. He never forgot the needs and problems of working people.

It is ironic that JOHN FOGARTY's death followed by less than a year that of Michigan's former senior Senator, and my good friend, the late Patrick V. McNamara. Senator McNamara and Congressman FOGARTY were the principal sponsors, in the Senate and House, respectively, of the Older Americans Act of 1965 which created the Administration on Aging, to deal with the problems of our Nation's senior citizens.

It was symbolic that JOHN FOGARTY died only a few hours before he was scheduled to speak at a rally of the National Council of Senior Citizens. The council members stood in a minute of silent tribute to a man who had been a major spokesman in Congress for older Americans.

It was symbolic, too, that death came to JOHN FOGARTY only 2 hours before the opening of the 90th Congress, in which he would have played a major role.

I will personally miss JOHN FOGARTY, and his presence will be greatly missed in this Congress. We can best honor his memory by rededicating ourselves to the goals to which he dedicated his life.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I join my colleagues today in paying just tribute to one of our greatest Members whose untimely passing shocked all of us a short time before this 90th Congress convened

on January 10. The Honorable JOHN FOGARTY was not only one of our most distinguished Members—he was also a great American and a humanitarian of the first order.

JOHN FOGARTY was a dedicated public servant who represented the people of his district in Rhode Island as a Member of this body for 26 years. During that time he compiled an enviable record as the champion of better health for all Americans. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations, he constantly led the fight for adequate funds to conduct research and other programs to help wipe out our deadliest diseases, to construct hospitals and nursing homes to care for the ill as well as the crippled and the retarded, to train more doctors to treat our illnesses, and to construct community health centers.

Coming as I do from the city of Baltimore, which is one of the greatest medical centers of our country, I am quite naturally very much interested in medical research and the relief of human suffering caused by disease. Perhaps that is why my respect and admiration for JOHN FOGARTY ripened into a lasting friendship. It was not long after I became a Member of this body that I recognized in him those qualities of a true statesman which make the world a better place for all of us.

Relatively few Members who have served in this historic Chamber over the years had a wider range of interests than JOHN FOGARTY. It was not only the fields of health and medicine that benefited by his efforts, but other areas were made richer by his work. In the field of culture, he was the original sponsor of legislation providing for the establishment of the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities. In the field of education he led the fight for adequate funds to construct schools, provide scholarships to our young people, and improve the quality of education generally. His devotion to the poor can be gathered from his efforts toward the enactment of the economic opportunity amendments of 1965. The annals of the House reflect the great humanity of this very distinguished and able man.

JOHN FOGARTY was a great leader, a most effective Member of Congress, a major architect in the fields of health and education, a man who earned the admiration and respect of a grateful Nation, and he will long be remembered.

I have lost a good personal friend, and our country has lost a great statesman with the passing of Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY. May he rest in peace in the knowledge that the world is a better place because of his endeavors.

I join my colleagues in extending my most heartfelt sympathy to his family.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late JOHN E. FOGARTY who for the past 26 years served the people of his district, the State of Rhode Island, and the Nation so ably.

I shall always remember our distinguished colleague as the man who stood in the forefront of every battle to preserve the Nation's health. His contributions to research on the causes of our killer diseases through legislation and the process of appropriations are a matter of record.

JOHN FOGARTY'S devotion and dedication was to meet the human needs of his fellow Americans. His was an unending and a tireless struggle to provide the necessary health facilities and personnel to mobilize an all-out attack on disease and illness. He was a man in search of a fifth freedom for all Americans—freedom from disease, illness, and disability.

I recall with personal pride my numerous discussions with our departed colleague. First in connection with medicare then successively on bills which I introduced or cosponsored, with H.R. 9318, a bill to combat heart disease, cancer, and stroke; H.R. 13358, a bill to establish a National Eye Institute; H.R. 16882 for the education and training of the handicapped; and my jet-noise bills because of the effect of noise upon the Nation's health. His patience, his counsel, his advice and guidance will long be remembered.

His presence in this Chamber will be sorely missed. We, the Members of the 90th Congress and future Congresses have inherited the responsibility to act as guardians of the Nation's health.

In tribute to his memory, I call upon my colleagues to rededicate ourselves to the cause of making the United States not only the wealthiest nation in the world, but also the healthiest. If we do this, then JOHN E. FOGARTY will not have died in vain. He will be with us always.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it would require more time than we have before us today to pay adequate tribute to the life and ideas of JOHN FOGARTY. It would take more foresight than we possess to gage fully the effects of his work upon present and future generations.

A great many qualities distinguished JOHN FOGARTY. Standing high among these were his dogged determination, his devout dedication, and his fighting spirit. These qualities, perhaps more than any others, characterized JOHN FOGARTY throughout his service to the people of Rhode Island and to the Nation.

As those of us who had the honor to serve with him on the House Appropriations Committee are well aware, JOHN FOGARTY left an indelible imprint on the proceedings and accomplishments of better health for Americans as well as better health facilities and more and better health research. He was recognized by friend and foe alike as a fighter for the principles in which he believed and for the plain people whom he loved. His steadfast championship of the cause of better health and rehabilitation services; and of his State, his section, and his Nation will stand forever as a monument to his years of devoted service to his country.

I think the following poem well typifies our late friend. He was ever active, always understanding, helpful, interested in the other man's problem:

SERMONS WE SEE

I'd rather see a sermon than hear one any day
I'd rather one should walk with me than merely tell the way.
The eye's a better pupil and more willing than the ear;
Fine counsel is confusing, but example's always clear;
And the best of all the preachers are the men who live their creeds,
For to see the good in action is what everybody needs.
I can soon learn how to do it if you will let me see it done;
I can watch your hands in action, but your tongue too fast may run.
And the lectures you deliver may be very wise and true;
But I'd rather get my lessons by observing what you do.
For I may misunderstand you and the high advice you give.
But there's no misunderstanding how you act and how you live.

EDGAR A. GUEST.

I extend to Mrs. Fogarty and to the other members of the family my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened and shocked to receive word of the passing of our beloved and esteemed colleague, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY.

I was privileged to serve with JOHN FOGARTY in the House for 26 years. He was a conscientious Member of this body and will be remembered for his countless contributions to the fields of education, health, and welfare which have been such a help to hundreds of thousands of citizens of this country.

I know of no Member who took a greater interest in medical research, or in developing programs to advance the cause of medical research. I know of no Member who was more interested in aiding our older people, or our disabled. I know of no one who had a larger compassion for the unfortunate or the retarded or disabled. He has helped build a public and private health service in which this Nation can take enormous pride.

He was a man of courage, conviction, and integrity, and he will be sorely missed by his constituency, his State, and the Nation. His devoted service to the people he represented will always be remembered.

I have lost a valued friend and colleague. I extend to his family my sincerest condolences. His monument is already built in the many fields of human endeavor to which he contributed so much of himself and his energy.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY is a deep personal loss to those of us who knew him so well as one of the truly great humanitarians in this House.

As colleagues, we will miss his hard work, his straightforward honesty, and his valued advice and counsel. We quickly learned to depend on JOHN FOGARTY for strength and wisdom in turning back the obstinate plagues which have incapacitated and crippled mankind and taken the very life from poor and rich alike.

JOHN FOGARTY'S dedicated work to end the suffering from illness and disease, to make our world more livable, and to advance the cause of mankind everywhere is an everlasting monument to his greatness.

All the people of this Nation have ben-

efited from his relentless efforts in combating these plagues. The intensity of his work in seeking cures to the basic health problems was no doubt a factor in his untimely passing.

In returning JOHN FOGARTY to the Congress every 2 years since 1940, the people of Rhode Island acknowledged the value of his work as their representative. His interest in the greater development of his region was well recognized. His work in behalf of the young, the poor, and the less fortunate is legend.

Lesser men would have been content to rest on their laurels after fewer accomplishments than those achieved for all mankind by JOHN FOGARTY. But he was not content as long as any task remained to be completed.

We will miss his powerful voice, his dedicated work, and his warm companionship. Our loss will be shared by all the people of this Nation.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his family at this time of their great grief.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this House and particularly the Appropriations Committee will deeply miss the presence of JOHN FOGARTY.

Congressman FOGARTY, during his distinguished career, exemplified the best qualities of a public servant. He was dedicated to providing his district and State with representative leadership in the Congress. He was unswervingly loyal to our Nation.

As chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare, he awoke the Nation to the need for new programs to help ease pain and suffering. I have worked with him many times on legislation to provide more nurses and on other health matters and always found him to be earnest, diligent, and effective in helping to find solutions to our many problems in this field.

The National Institutes of Health will ever be a monument to his love of people, his desire to ease human suffering, and his ability to help create institutions and programs that give rather than take from man.

It has been a privilege to know JOHN FOGARTY, to work with him, and to have served with him in this House. I know that everyone who has known him feels richer by reason of that experience.

To his wife, daughter, and family I extend my own deep and sincere sympathy in their great loss and would remind them in the words so beautifully translated from the Sanskrit by Sir Edwin Arnold:

BHAGARAD-GITA (SONG CELESTIAL)

Never the spirit was born; the spirit shall cease to be never;
Never was time it was not; End and Beginning are dreams!
Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit for ever;
Death hath not touched it at all, dead though the house of it seems.

Nay, but as one who layeth
His worn-out robes away,
And taking new ones, sayeth,
"These will I wear today!"
So putteth by the spirit
Lightly its robe of flesh,
And passeth to inherit
A residence afresh.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, has taken one of the stalwarts from the House and we shall all be much poorer for it.

JOHN FOGARTY was a dedicated and conscientious legislator whose interest in the health and welfare of people throughout the Nation was translated into action. He will be long remembered for his effective work as chairman of the subcommittee that appropriated funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

JOHN FOGARTY was a patriotic citizen, a devout Democrat, and a man of reason and integrity. He enjoyed the friendship and respect of his colleagues throughout the Congress and while we shall greatly miss his presence, the results of his work in terms of a richer and better life for countless people will stand as a monument to him in his district, State, and Nation.

To his entire family I extend deep and sincere sympathy.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic and somehow tragic that we save our finest tributes to men and reserve our praises for their qualities and accomplishments until their death. Mankind has always been at a loss for an adequate response to the passage of men of heroic stature. Thus we find ourselves today for certainly one such man was the late JOHN FOGARTY, so recently and vigorously of this House.

Here was a man vibrantly alive. I first heard of JOHN FOGARTY many years ago; I read of a tough, Irish bricklayer and labor leader who had come to the Congress from Rhode Island, full of youth and fire and a passion for truth. When I came to the 89th Congress, I knew him as a man unrivaled in the history of this Nation as a true champion of public health and medical research. In the interim JOHN FOGARTY had compiled a record of driving excellence and mature vision through 12 Congresses and 24 years. It was my great honor to serve with him in the 89th Congress. He will not be forgotten.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to our late colleague, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY. His death is a great loss not only to his colleagues and to the people in the State of Rhode Island but to our country. He served his constituents and his country so well he earned the respect and admiration of us all.

JOHN FOGARTY worked earnestly in behalf of cancer research and for the mentally retarded and his efforts were well recognized by all who knew him. He deserved the many honors he received. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Health, Education, and Welfare he helped to initiate legislation which has made the National Institutes of Health one of the most outstanding medical research centers in the world.

JOHN FOGARTY'S love for the House of Representatives and his loyalty to his constituents was so great that when he was given the opportunity to run for the U.S. Senate he decided to continue to represent the Second District in Rhode Island. His leadership, his great integrity and personal courage will surely be missed by those who considered him a valued friend.

I am very proud to have had the honor to have served with JOHN FOGARTY, and to have called him a true friend. At this time, I extend my sympathy to his wife, to his family and to all those who loved him.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to the many who have already paid tribute to a remarkable public servant, our beloved colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY. I had the opportunity to know JOHN FOGARTY and to work with him in 17 of his 26 years in Congress, as he built a well-earned respect and affection among his colleagues, and an equally well-earned reputation as "Mr. Public Health" within the Nation.

In looking back over that period of time, I can think of no one among us who developed his talents and interests, who matured in his insight into the fields that were his particular responsibility, as he did. Rev. Joseph L. Lennon, O.P., dean of Providence College, put it simply and succinctly in his eulogy of JOHN FOGARTY when he said: "He grew with his job."

And it would be well to add that JOHN FOGARTY was a major factor in the growth of his job and his responsibilities as chairman and member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. His efforts in the health and aging fields have earned him a secure place in the ranks of those public servants to whom we in America, and, indeed, people throughout the world, will be ever grateful and indebted. The striking thing is that so many of the research or other federally assisted programs he originated grew from his own observation and sincere interest in the plight of others. He was able to become concerned about heart disease, mental retardation among children, multiple sclerosis, medical personnel, shortages, cancer research, the aging. And he translated that concern into positive programs that will be a tribute to his work for generations to come.

The final and most rewarding tribute, however, comes from the people he knew and loved best, the people of his district. I had the sad but privileged duty of being a member of the official congressional delegation to his funeral. You needed only to talk with those who knew him, and see the assemblage of persons from all walks of life, of all ages there in Providence to know how sorely he will be missed by the people of Rhode Island. His country and his colleagues will miss him deeply too.

My heartfelt sympathy is extended to his wife and family.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the House and the Nation today to honor a friend and a colleague, the late JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

JOHN FOGARTY had no enemies. His warmth and his friendship graced these Chambers for over a quarter century.

He brought to this membership a quiet

respect and deep dedication to the principles of a free society.

As a ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, he distinguished himself by his hard work and clear understanding of the needs of a growing nation. His experience, wisdom, and judgment will especially be missed by his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee.

I am grateful for the years of friendship and guidance which JOHN FOGARTY extended to me as a Member of this body.

I extend to the people of his district my sincere regrets on the untimely passing of a trusted public servant. And to his family, I extend my heartfelt condolences.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in expressing the deep sense of loss felt by the people of Rhode Island and by every Member of this body with the death of Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY.

He was a moving force behind legislation for medical research, for hospitals, for institutions to aid the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. No one in the history of this land has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities than Congressman FOGARTY. His list of accomplishments and awards for services have justly earned him the title "Mr. Public Health."

I had the benefit of his advice, cooperation and valuable assistance when I served as a member of the Health and Safety Subcommittee. JOHN deserved much credit for favorable action taken by the Congress when it first brought needed assistance to the schools of public health which provide vital help to the Nation and its people.

He ennobled our Nation, the House of Representatives, and the citizens of Rhode Island whom he so faithfully served. Aside from his awards and accomplishments, JOHN FOGARTY will be remembered for the man he was and as his friends knew him—kind, understanding, and completely unassuming. I deem it an honor to have served with him and to have considered him a personal friend.

I am sure every Member of the Congress joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his wife and family in this time of sorrow.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to associate myself with the remarks of our colleagues concerning the Honorable JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY. This truly great Rhode Island legislator has erected a towering monument to his memory through the leadership he has provided in the building of programs and institutes to develop and protect the human resources of this great Nation.

History records he was a bricklayer. The bricks and mortar laid by JOHN FOGARTY can be discerned in the expanding institutions of higher education affording new and improved learning opportunities for our citizens resulting from his guiding hand on appropriation measures to fund meaningful programs. They can be seen in those national institutes which are effectively coping with the disease and infirmity which collects an exorbitant toll from the human resources of our Nation.

His lifelong campaign, directed by his intense compassion, to improve opportunities for people to participate and share in the great affluence of our democracy, was conducted with great modesty and with what will be recorded by history as almost legendary legislative skill. Indicative of his humility is the fact that the current Congressional Directory—of all the great things that may be said about him—carries only this line:

JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY, Democrat, of Harmony, R.I., elected in 1940; reelected to succeeding Congresses.

The Honorable JOHN FOGARTY was, indeed, a representative of his constituents, and the Nation will harvest for a long time to come the seeds sown by his great statesmanship.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to the dedicated service and tremendous contributions in the national interest of the late JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

During the entirety of my tenure in Congress, I have been fortunate to receive counsel continually from JOHN FOGARTY during the course of legislative activities over the past 14 years. His friendship has been of great importance to me personally. He was a wise and judicious man who never failed to place the interest of this country above all considerations. The legislative accomplishments attributed to him are but a fraction of the total contributions he actually made to the health and welfare of the people of our country.

While it is difficult to contemplate how history might have differed were it not for one man, it is possible to know the long list of significant contributions JOHN FOGARTY made. His record in the field of health and welfare was so comprehensive, his name and work dominate the field throughout the country. It was a fitting tribute that flags flew at half staff on the buildings of health institutions, public and private, throughout the country as a voluntary act of homage to a great leader.

We will miss him in the House of Representatives and in the country.

I wish to include in my remarks a copy of an article written for the Cleveland Press by Marie Daerr, reporting Mr. FOGARTY's visit to Cleveland on January 4, 1967. As well, I wish to include a fine tribute written by Howard A. Rusk, M.D., in the New York Times January 15, 1967, called "Mr. Public Health."

I wish to convey my condolences to Mrs. Fogarty and to his children who can be proud of the exemplary record of this fine gentleman.

The articles follow:

[From the Cleveland Press, Jan. 5, 1967]

ELDERLY URGED TO WATCH CONGRESS

(By Marie Daerr)

It is essential that older people be kept up to date on legislation—and that, as responsible citizens, they let their representatives in Congress know their reactions.

Cong. John E. Fogarty (D-R.I.) had this message today for 400 older adults attending the Live Long and Like It Library Club's annual institute at Higbee's. The all-day event marked the Cleveland Public Library group's 20th birthday.

On the program were Fogarty, Louis B. Seltzer, former editor of The Press; Mrs. Lucia Bing, retired coordinator of volunteers for the Golden Age Center, and Miss Fern Long, Live Long and Like It adviser and head of the library's adult education department.

Fogarty praised Miss Long for the imagination and leadership she has shown in guiding the club since 1946 and said its program, "has been widely imitated but never duplicated."

Fogarty said that, in spite of much publicity given Medicare before its enactment, there still is much misunderstanding about the program. He made a plea for a public information program to relate the legislation he introduced last year, known as Livingcare or the Health Education Act of 1966, and the Social Security Amendments of 1966, which he said he planned to introduce again.

Seltzer said that, while American society has done much to secure people against the hazards of old age, through such programs as retirement benefits and Medicare, it must redirect its efforts to help them to "a maximum and most meaningful use of their time." This would come through such aids as job opportunities and crafts and hobby classes.

"It is a monumental tragedy that we have lengthened people's lives, then farmed them out, left to their own devices," Seltzer said. "They get their pension checks, their Social Security, then what?"

[From the New York Times, Jan. 15, 1967]

MR. PUBLIC HEALTH—DEATH ENDS LONG FIGHT BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY TO GIVE AMERICA FREEDOM FROM DISEASE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

If hospitals, research laboratories and institutes for the aged, infirm and retarded had flagpoles, every flag would have flown at half-staff this past week to mourn the loss of John E. Fogarty.

Representative Fogarty of Rhode Island died of a heart attack last Tuesday at the age of 53.

Flags at half-staff would not, however, have been limited to institutions. They would also have been in evidence in thousands of homes throughout Rhode Island and the nation.

Mr. Fogarty was not just interested in institutions and dollars. He was interested in people, and no appeal for help that went to his office was ever left unanswered. He would go to inordinate ends to try to find the solution to problems that were all too often insoluble.

No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

PLANNED NEW CRUSADE

Ironically, his death came just before he was to be sworn in for his 14th term—a time when he was mobilizing his forces for another all-out crusade against disease, disability and death.

Also ironically, his death was caused by a heart attack, his own personal public enemy number one as the primary killer of others.

The contribution of John Fogarty to improving health and rehabilitation services for the American people are legend.

When he entered Congress our Federal investment in medical research was but $3-million. It is now well over $1-billion.

During his freshman year in the House of Representatives, the number of disabled persons rehabilitated into employment under

the public program was but 12,000. Last year it was more than 154,000.

Medicare, Medicaid, more nursing home beds, Federal aid for the training of physicians and other health workers, the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health, workshops and classrooms for the mentally retarded and all of the other tremendous advances in health and rehabilitation in the last quarter century stand as monuments to this late "Mr. Public Health."

He and his co-worker in the Senate, Senator Lister Hill from Alabama, were recognized as the great health leaders of all time. They complemented and supplemented each other in their continuing fight for the fifth freedom—freedom from disease.

STARTED AS BRICKLAYER

Mr. Fogarty's formal education ended when he received his high school diploma. He immediately followed in the footsteps of his father and older brother and became an apprentice bricklayer.

He was only 27 when he was first elected to Congress from Rhode Island. During World War II he served as an enlisted man in the Navy construction corps. After the war he returned to Congress to carry the torch for the enlisted men in the armed forces.

Having been denied a formal education and a college degree, he made possible through his untiring efforts the education of literally thousands of others as physicians, scientists and technicians because he cared.

Some years ago Mr. Fogarty was challenged with the opportunity to run for the Senate from Rhode Island. After a great deal of discussion with his friends and colleagues he decided his destiny was in the House of Representatives where he could continue his fight for health as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

This was a decision that for suffering humanity was a blessed one.

John Fogarty, who started as a bricklayer, ended his career by placing countless bricks in a solid foundation of modern laboratories, medical schools, hospitals, institutions for the mentally ill and the retarded, and research laboratories that extend from the halls of science to the community itself.

With his bright green tie and his Irish accent, he was a circuit rider for health, a teacher, a preacher, a fearless foe to any challenger who stood in the way of his crusade.

He died on the field of battle. His friends from the scientist to the sick mourn his loss and call him blessed.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the very untimely passing of my beloved and valued friend, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, was a very great shock to all of us who knew him, to his admiring colleagues in the House and innumerable people in his great district, his State, the Nation, and the world.

This great American was called to his Maker at a time when truly he had not even reached the crest of his powers, and ordinarily could look forward to many more years of constructive achievement for the people, and happiness with his family and friends. He seemed to be as vigorous as ever and there was no sign of his impending passing.

JOHN FOGARTY was outstanding in every sense of the word. His brilliant career in the public service was one of the most fruitful, colorful, and illustrious ever recorded in the Congress of the United States.

He started from humble beginnings. He worked hard for everything he got; he overcame all obstacles. By virtue of great natural ability, strength of character, the force of his dynamic personality, and his resolute spirit, he steadily moved forward with confidence, vigor and speed.

At a very early age, he was elected to the Congress of the United States. His record in this body has been one of paramount distinction, marked by highest honors and one triumph after another.

Congressman FOGARTY did not come to this body to serve any special privilege. He came here ably, faithfully, and honorably to serve the people of his district and Nation and he made it clear from the start that he meant business.

Early in life he had noted the struggles, the disadvantages, the adversities, the handicaps of ordinary members of the rank and file. He knew and understood their problems and was interested in promoting their welfare and betterment.

Early he realized that ordinary working people needed higher standards of living, better opportunities for education and improvements in the leadership, agencies, and instrumentalities devoted to promoting the public health and well-being.

Like some others with a mission, he found in the panel of the great House Appropriations Committee, to which he was assigned, colleagues and kindred spirits who, like himself, had noticed certain, well-defined health needs of the people, and were willing to exert every effort to meet them.

JOHN FOGARTY was an untiring worker and never spared himself for a moment. He had high goals, lofty principles, noble aims, and was admirably equipped to advance them. He had the ability, courage, unflagging energy, and unswerving dedication to tackle social problems that few dared to touch at the time.

It was not long, however, until under his inspiring leadership, his dreams and his humane practical conceptions and ideas for promoting the health of the American people started to take concrete shape, and before long, the ofttime slowly moving legislative mills of the Congress were sparked into concrete, effective action.

It is said by the celebrated expert and commentator, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, in the New York Times:

> No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities, and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

And that puts it in accurate terms.

Some years ago JOHN suffered a serious heart attack which slowed him down for a while, but did not deter him for long from the most energetic pursuit of his established goals.

A man of profound religious faith and devotion, he was content to leave his own destiny in the hands of his Creator, and he stanchly drew on all his resources, physical, intellectual, political, spiritual, and inspirational, almost as an evangelist with a holy cause, hammering out one measure after another to set up, strengthen, and perfect the institutes of health, the basic research institutions, and related agencies, for attacking the killer diseases, like cancer, heart trouble, vascular, circulatory and stroke-producing diseases, muscular dystrophy, mental retardation, fibrosis, and a host of spastic and congenital afflictions which have plagued humanity for centuries and have been getting worse in recent years, and which this great, brave son of Rhode Island rightly believed should be banished from the earth.

How well he did this overall job is written in golden letters in the permanent records of this House and the other body, and in the prayers and gratitude of the American people.

It is doubtful whether so many people in this country suffering from killer and other diseases now or in the foreseeable future, and who have been or will be cured or relieved will ever owe so much to one individual as the very many victims of previously incurable diseases now owe, and will continue to owe, to JOHN FOGARTY of Rhode Island for the merciful aid and deliverance which his inspired leadership assured for them.

When he entered Congress the appropriation for medical research was $2 million a year, and now, thanks to the influence and impetus of his truly blessed work and idealism, it is over a billion a year and will continue to grow in the future, until science will at last be able to unlock the many more secrets that will permit millions of human beings, heretofore doomed to early death, or to lives of helplessness, need, and pain, to enjoy normal spans of life and escape from excruciating suffering.

Is it any wonder that JOHN FOGARTY should be referred to as "Mr. Public Health" by Dr. Rusk and other experts too numerous to mention in the best position of all to appraise his tremendously historic and effective contributions to suffering mankind. It can be said without fear of contradiction, and unquestionably, that JOHN FOGARTY is the greatest political health leader in our history, and his colleagues, his able, devoted staff, and those who worked with him in the committee and the House, and the other body, can be proud of his great work and proud of the support and invaluable aid they gave him.

This is also true of his coworkers in the other body, Senator LISTER HILL and his colleagues, all very able, distinguished leaders, and the wonderful thing about this memorable achievement was that these dedicated collaborators and assistants, and all who worked with the great JOHN FOGARTY, recognized the epochal nature, import and effects of his carefully selected, fixed goals and the miracles they would work for the American people and the human race.

JOHN FOGARTY was the driving force that translated into speedy, administrative action the research and application in our hospital, clinical and medical systems of the great, scientific and medical discoveries, techniques, equipment, appliances, therapies and methods that have worked such wonders in free, modern medicine and that have brought truly immeasurable blessings to so many people.

I would like to touch upon the personal

side of JOHN FOGARTY, because to those of us who knew him well, he was a remarkable person, who at once inspired respect, admiration, and affection.

To know him well is to love him.

There were many unusual, impressive, and attractive facets to his character and makeup.

He was strong, powerful and rugged physically, and did not know the meaning of the word fear.

He had a natural, quick, alert mind that enabled him to make sharp, accurate, speedy appraisals.

He was articulate and forceful in his speech, capable of decisions, and persuasive in his advocacy.

When aroused by an allegiance to a cause, he was militant and unswerving.

He was straightforward, direct, and fairminded, and never struck a low blow.

He was shrewd and canny in negotiations, artful and clever in gaining his ends, resourceful in putting his ideas and his measures through his committee, the House, and the Congress.

He was profoundly religious minded, and he proudly wore for everyone to see the badge and the stamp of his Irish ancestry, from which he felt he drew much of his strength, his power, his courage, his zeal for good, humane causes, his humor, sympathetic nature and his strong sense of loyalty, which was one of the dominating qualities he possessed.

Rigorously honest, outspoken and forthright, candid and resolute—he was a man whose friendship meant something more than lipservice.

He could always be counted on to stand up and fight for his friends or for any cause to which he was attached.

JOHN was firm in his principles and fiercely intent upon his goals, but he was kindly and considerate of others—strong of will, but gentle of heart, and generous of impulse, a man who dealt in warm, personal values, rather than in the cold, unfeeling absolutes of the computer, a man who commanded respect for his integrity and greatness, admiration for his faith and his courage, and love for his loyalty and his essential goodness as a human being.

An unfaltering patriot and lover of his country and its free institutions, JOHN could not be excelled in his eagerness to sacrifice of himself to defend, strengthen, and enrich this Nation.

In war and peace, he served, far beyond the call of duty, to protect our country and make it a better place in which to live.

Deep in his conviction that this is truly the government of the people, he won the plaudits and the hearts of his countrymen for his untiring, determined efforts and labors to improve the health and lengthen the lifespan of the people through vigorous, intelligent development and application of the wonders and miracles of modern science and the genius of humane statesmanship.

JOHN FOGARTY saw the light and followed the star of his dream to the lofty pinnacles of constructive fulfillment and noble achievement for suffering humanity.

And if we could but ask him today, what inspired him, I know he would say in his characteristically direct way that his dream was in part an Irish dream, touched and colored by the sufferings, aspirations, and glories of Erin, a dream that sprang up from the soil and the travails of that once ravaged land, through indomitable God-fearing ancestors, who found in this country the blessings of freedom and opportunity denied them in their own cherished homeland, and who implanted into the breast of JOHN FOGARTY the undying love and loyalty to the United States, and its people, and this great Government, that prompted him, in such a real sense, to devote his life, and in the end to give his life, for the benefit and betterment of his fellow Americans and his fellow man. And he gave his life for the greater security, strength, and glory of his beloved country, just as a fighting man stricken in battle.

Yes, it was in truth, in the merciful work of human betterment and alleviation from suffering that JOHN FOGARTY throughout his long, distinguished service gave his all, and finally his life.

As the poet said:

In the world of time and space among the bulk of actual things,
A dream was dreamed in his heart
And he asked himself again and again, like the poet, Can that dream come true?

Can millions and millions of people, many yet unborn, dwell in the house that JOHN FOGARTY shaped in his heart, the noble house of his thoughts and his dreams?

Thank God, he got his answer, and he lived to see his dream written into law, and become a part of this great Government of ours to bring many blessings and promises of help to countless afflicted, distressed, and helpless human beings, heretofore condemned to lifetimes of suffering.

I could ask: "What greater love hath any man than that he should lay down his life for his friends?"

This House, this generation hails and acclaims JOHN FOGARTY, and mankind will long continue to sing his praises and utter prayers of gratitude to the one who, more than others, although he enjoyed the encouragement, support and effective help of others, opened the door that has liberated millions of human beings from the darkness and anguish of pain and suffering into the bright sunlight of restored health and well-being.

Who knows, indeed, what the future will bring in the furtherance of his work, what miracles and wonders may yet be worked in the battle of man against disease, disability, handicap, retardation, pain, and suffering that has been launched by this great American, whom we so deeply and so sorrowfully mourn.

It is with very heavy hearts that we bid our sad farewells to this great, illustrious leader, who was our dear, beloved friend, and the stalwart worker and fighter for truth, progress, and justice for the inarticulate and the helpless.

As was his way in life, he has gone from us, smiling, fearless, and unafraid, to "that land from whose bourne no traveler ever returns."

His passing leaves an irreplaceable void in this great House and in the hearts of his friends.

In these historic Halls and in this Nation, and in the world of humanity, JOHN FOGARTY will never be forgotten.

He will always be remembered for his dream and the rich blessings which its fulfillment has brought to the world.

We will continue his unfinished work; the great aims he had in mind. We will take up the torch he lighted.

Our prayers and our tears attend him now, as we bid him farewell; our good comrade and devoted friend, called all too soon in the prime of his life to his heavenly reward. But we must reconcile ourselves to the divine will.

To his gracious, loving wife and helpmate, Luise, and his lovely, young daughter, Mary, of whom he was so proud, and his wonderful family, his beloved brothers and sisters, his dear ones, and the dedicated colleagues and staff members who worked so devotedly with him, all so sorrowfully bereaved, I extend the most heartfelt sympathy and prayers of myself and family.

And in behalf of the people of my great congressional district, which touches on the great district represented by Congressman FOGARTY in this House, and where he was so well known, so highly esteemed and loved, I also express deepest sympathy and condolence to his bereaved family.

May our dearly beloved friend, JOHN, find rest and peace in his eternal home. His blessed memory will always remain with us to guide and inspire us in our work.

Some words of the Irish poet, Padraic Pearse come to mind:

I have vision and prophecy and the gift of fiery speech,
I that have spoken with God on the top of His holy hill—
And because I am of the people, I understand the people.
My heart has been heavy with the grief of mothers.
My eyes have been wet with the tears of children.
What if the dream comes true, and if millions unborn shall dwell.
In the house that I shaped in my heart, the noble house of my thought?

JOHN FOGARTY's dream, now coming true, will brighten and bless humankind for many years to come.

God love him.

As part of my remarks I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article captioned "Mr. Public Health," by the distinguished commentator and expert, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, recently appearing in the New York Times which touched very significantly upon Congressman FOGARTY's magnificent achievements.

MR. PUBLIC HEALTH—DEATH ENDS LONG FIGHT BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY TO GIVE AMERICA FREEDOM FROM DISEASE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

If hospitals, research laboratories and institutes for the aged, infirm and retarded had flagpoles, every flag would have flown at half-staff this past week to mourn the loss of John E. FOGARTY.

Representative Fogarty of Rhode Island died of a heart attack last Tuesday at the age of 53.

Flags at half-staff would not, however, have

been limited to institutions. They would also have been in evidence in thousands of homes throughout Rhode Island and the nation.

Mr. Fogarty was not just interested in institutions and dollars. He was interested in people, and no appeal for help that went to his office was ever left unanswered. He would go to inordinate ends to try to find the solution to problems that were all too often insoluble.

No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

PLANNED NEW CRUSADE

Ironically, his death came just before he was to be sworn in for his 14th term—a time when he was mobilizing his forces for another all-out crusade against disease, disability and death.

Also ironically, his death was caused by a heart attack, his own personal public enemy number one as the primary killer of others.

The contribution of John Fogarty to improving health and rehabilitation services for the American people are legend.

When he entered Congress our Federal investment in medical research was but $3 million. It is now well over $1 billion.

During his freshman year in the House of Representatives, the number of disabled persons rehabilitated into employment under the public program was but 12,000. Last year it was more than 154,000.

Medicare, Medicaid, more nursing home beds, Federal aid for the training of physicians and other health workers, the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health, workshops and classrooms for the mentally retarded and all of the other tremendous advances in health and rehabilitation in the last quarter century stand as monuments to this late "Mr. Public Health."

He and his co-worker in the Senate, Senator Lister Hill from Alabama, were recognized as the great health leaders of all time. They complemented and supplemented each other in their continuing fight for the fifth freedom—freedom from disease.

STARTED AS BRICKLAYER

Mr. Fogarty's formal education ended when he received his high school diploma. He immediately followed in the footsteps of his father and older brother and became an apprentice bricklayer.

He was only 27 when he was first elected to Congress from Rhode Island. During World War II he served as an enlisted man in the Navy construction corps. After the war he returned to Congress to carry the torch for the enlisted men in the armed forces.

Having been denied a formal education and a college degree, he made possible through his untiring efforts the education of literally thousands of others as physicians, scientists and technicians because he cared.

Some years ago, Mr. Fogarty was challenged with the opportunity to run for the Senate from Rhode Island. After a great deal of discussion with his friends and colleagues he decided his destiny was in the House of Representatives where he could continue his fight for health as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Health, Education and Welfare.

This was a decision that for suffering humanity was a blessed one.

John Fogarty, who started as a bricklayer, ended his career by placing countless bricks in a solid foundation of modern laboratories, medical schools, hospitals, institutions for the mentally ill and the retarded, and research laboratories that extend from the halls of science to the community itself.

With his bright green tie and his Irish accent, he was a circuit rider for health, a teacher, a preacher, a fearless foe to any challenger who stood in the way of his crusade.

He died on the field of battle. His friends from the scientist to the sick mourn his loss and call him blessed.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved when I heard of the death of my deep, warm, personal friend, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY.

JOHN was a great American, a defender of labor, and a great legislator. His name will stand out forever for the advances that he was responsible for in seeking appropriations for medical research, mental health, child welfare, cancer, heart—the ailment of which he succumbed—and in many other diseases and afflictions affecting mankind, rich or poor.

As a bricklayer and a member of the bricklayers' union, he was in the foremost rank as the defender of labor and collective bargaining. Recently, the article below appeared in the Bricklayer, Mason and Plasterer magazine. I am proud to present this outstanding tribute to JOHN FOGARTY and call its attention to the Congress.

JOHN FOGARTY was a proud Irish-American. He was a credit to the Congress of the United States and his beloved State of Rhode Island. He will be long missed by his many friends and officials in the Nation. It will be my earnest prayer that the good Lord will shower him with many blessings and eternal rest. May his beloved family, proud of his dedication to his Nation—leaving to them a great heritage and loving memory, be protected with God's blessing:

PASSING OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY A LOSS TO THE COUNTRY AND THIS UNION

The sudden passing of Congressman John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island, who had been a highly regarded member of this International Union for 35 years, will be felt as a great void among those in our country who care about the health and welfare of people everywhere. Always proud of the fact that he was a bricklayer, Congressman Fogarty made an indelible impression on the many hundreds of I.U. members he had met over the years.

In particular, delegates to the I.U. convention last year in Montreal have vivid memories of his convention talk in which he called for greater appropriations to meet America's health needs, and of his reminiscences about his early days as a bricklayer in Providence, Rhode Island, where he started serving his apprenticeship in January 1932 and became a journeyman member of Local 1 in May 1938. He was elected to Congress in 1940 after having served as President of Local 1.

A man with a previous history of a heart attack, he died in his office on Capitol Hill on January 10 about two hours before the start of the 90th Congress. He was 53. As chairman of the House appropriations subcommittee handling health, education and welfare matters, he was a powerful figure in Congress.

In his remarks to the Montreal convention, Congressman Fogarty recalled that when he first ran for Congress in 1940, he was earning $1.50 an hour as a union bricklayer and "averaging $45 a week." When he suddenly found himself making $10,000 a year (a Congressman's pay at that time), he thought he would be a rich man. He confided to the delegates that he thought he owed more money than when he was first elected to Congress.

Many eminent persons had some fine things to say about this outstanding Congressman and outstanding bricklayer. Here are some of the things said:

"John Fogarty was a great leader and an effective member of Congress. I am shocked and saddened by his death. He was a major architect in the fields of health and education. Lady Bird and I extend our deepest sympathies to his wife and daughter."—President Lyndon B. Johnson.

"I am shocked and grieved in the death of my dear friend, Congressman John E. Fogarty. He was not only a great legislator and a great American, but he was one of God's noblemen. His name will forever occupy prominent pages in the history of our country. For it was under the leadership of Congressman Fogarty that the tremendous advances were made in the making of appropriations in the fields of medical research, mental health, child welfare, heart, cancer, and all other conditions afflicting mankind."—John McCormack, speaker of the House of Representatives.

"John Fogarty was always a credit to the Congress and a credit to this International Union. I am personally grieved by the loss of a dear friend."—President Thomas F. Murphy of the BM&PIU.

"This is a tremendous loss to the country, especially that phase of government that has to do with national health. Rhode Island and the Congress will not be the same without him."—Senator John O. Pastore of Rhode Island.

"As an individual, Congressman Fogarty believed that his government should care about people who lacked access to good health and adequate opportunity. As chairman of the Congressional subcommittee that appropriated funds for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, he provided the leadership that gave his fellow man the opportunity to live a healthier and richer life. . . . We shall miss his presence. But his work will live on in those millions of people who have a better life because of his outstanding efforts in the Congress."—Chairman John M. Bailey of the Democratic National Committee.

JOHN E. FOGARTY'S FAVORITE VISION

(From an address by Mrs. James Bush-Brown Director, Pennsylvania School of Horticulture for Women)

Perhaps you have heard the story of Christopher Wren, one of the greatest of English architects, who walked one day unrecognized among the men who were at work upon the building of St. Paul's cathedral in London which he had designed. "What are you doing?" he inquired of one of the workmen, and the man replied, "I am cutting a piece of stone." As he went on he put the same question to another man, and the man replied, "I am earning five shillings twopence a day," and to a third man he addressed the same inquiry and the man answered, "I am helping Sir Christopher Wren build a beautiful cathedral." That man had vision. He could see beyond the cutting of the stone, beyond the earning of his daily wage, to the creation of a work of art—the building of a great cathedral. And in your life it is important for you to strive to attain a vision of the large whole.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the family of JOHN FOGARTY—his wife Luise, his daughter Mary, his brothers and his sister—his many, many friends and his devoted staff, I should like to express my heartfelt thanks to my colleagues for the many eloquent and sincere tributes that have been paid to our late departed colleague. I am sure that they would ask me at this time to express their sincere appreciation to you for the

many wonderful words that have been spoken about this truly great American.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of gaining a greater insight into the extraordinary personage of our beloved late colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY, I would like to have the following articles inserted in the RECORD. They include memoriams from: His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, who worked closely with JOHN FOGARTY rendering assistance to retarded children or "exceptional children" as the good cardinal refers to them; Constance Laliberte, who worked for Congressman FOGARTY and is now associated with the Neighborhood Youth Corps; Maxwell M. Geffen, publisher of Medical World News and longtime friend of JOHN FOGARTY; Philip H. Ableson, editor of Science; and perhaps most beautiful of all, a number of statements given to Mrs. Fogarty by the children of St. Philip's School in Greenville, R.I., which was JOHN FOGARTY's parish:

STATEMENT BY HIS EMINENCE RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING, ARCHBISHOP OF BOSTON, IN MEMORIAM: CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY

Informed by good Father Geddes of a Requiem Mass to be celebrated Friday evening in memory of the late beloved Congressman John E. Fogarty, I am taking advantage of the occasion to record a few thoughts pertaining to my relationship with him and my appreciation of him.

Congressman Fogarty told me years ago that he was prompted to become interested in retarded children after reading a speech that I had made in behalf of over five million of these children in the United States. As his knowledge increased his great heart was soon attracted to these children and he immediately began to impress upon the members of the United States Congress our responsibility to help these "Exceptional Children of God". I call them "Exceptional" not because they are handsome or brilliant but because they give us an exceptional opportunity of showing our love for God by loving the least of His brethren.

No member of the National House of Representatives in modern times did more for these "Exceptional Children" and for others, poor and needy, than the dedicated Congressman John Fogarty. Time and again over the years he would contact me or I would contact him. As a result of this relationship I do not know of any Congressman who was more devoted to these mentally and physically handicapped children and other seemingly abandoned and helpless souls.

It is very significant to me that Honorable John Fogarty died suddenly of a heart attack. For years his heart, which was as big as himself, overflowed with love for the poor and the helpless. When it came to legislation pertaining to the physical and mental health of the citizens of this country, he was always in the forefront advocating in his very effective way federal aid in behalf of these and other forgotten souls.

His life, in my opinion, should be an inspiration to those who find it impossible to pursue the courses of higher education and are forced, as a result of lack of finances or some other cause, to find a living in the workaday world. His accomplishments, personal and official, are reminders to those in humble walks of life that education never ends and, no matter how lowly may be the work one does here below, it is always possible to go higher through personal efforts, noble aspirations and love for the poor.

In accordance with the spirit of the Second Vatican Council the Church is known as "the Servant Church." The Church is the Mystical Body of Christ rendering service to the world. Congressman John Fogarty was a faithful "servant" of the "Servant Church" long before the Second Vatican Council.

His death was sudden and a shock to his loved ones and all those who knew him, but we all have the consolation that here was a Christlike man going about doing good at all times, especially for those who could not help themselves.

His charitable soul is now, please God, in the Mansions of Heaven but his memory will live forever in the great social legislation that he sponsored or supported while serving within and without the United States Congress. We who knew him best and loved him most shall never forget him in our Masses, prayers and the fruits of our sacrifices. He shall always be an inspiration to me and others who loved his way of life on this earth.

Congressman Fogarty was a man of God—a layman who exemplified the ideal layman of the Servant Church. May he rest in peace and intercede for us all before the throne of God.

RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING,
Archbishop of Boston.

FRIEND OF THE COMMON MAN

(By Constance Laliberte)

John E. Fogarty, who rose from bricklayer to one of America's most influential congressmen, will long be remembered as a friend and inspiration to the NYC, especially by those who have participated in the Rhode Island Program.

He played an important role in forming the national legislation that brought the NYC into existence. Also, he worked diligently to secure sufficient funds for our state, thus making it possible for hundreds of teenagers to find employment through the NYC.

Congressman Fogarty can also serve as an inspiration to all of us. He was a champion for the cause of more beneficial health legislation. He was concerned about the common man and his problems. Countless people received help directly from him.

Congressman Fogarty earned every honor that was bestowed on him. He was one of our country's most prominent citizens, but he had to work his way up from humble beginnings. Perhaps this is why he took such an interest in the common man—he understood the problems of ordinary people.

Let us hope that the great work he began will be carried on in order to benefit future generations.

Just as the 90th Congress convened its first session on January 10, I learned that one of its most colorful and vital figures had passed away in his office across the street from the Capitol. John E. Fogarty, "union bricklayer," as he liked to call himself, was, as most everyone else described him, "Mr. Public Health." Though he represented the second district of Rhode Island in the smallest state of the Union for 26 years, he played a major role in the health progress of the entire nation as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee's powerful Subcommittee on Labor-HEW, which initiates all health appropriations legislation.

In 1946, the year before Congressman Fogarty joined the subcommittee, the National Institutes of Health spent only $3.5 million. For fiscal 1967, NIH was voted a budget of $1.5 billion. When he became chairman of the subcommittee in 1949, the total HEW budget was approximately $1 billion. But the final HEW budget voted for fiscal 1967, for which he was largely responsible, is $9.8 billion. And every dollar in that budget had to pass the zealous scrutiny of John Fogarty.

I could fill many pages with tales about this fabulous character. For years, we had the habit of spending an afternoon in New York (following the Lasker Award luncheon), reminiscing about our respective interests in the health field. The first time we met we were alone. The following year, two or three people joined our little coffee klatch. At our last get-together only a few weeks ago, after a meeting the Congressman had addressed in Washington, we were surrounded by a dozen distinguished representatives of government, medicine, and the pharmaceutical industry.

All of us were happy to bask in the sunshine of his quiet, self-effacing, off-the-cuff attitude. And all of us will miss him—one of Washington's truly irreplaceable men.

He declined the opportunity to become Senator from Rhode Island because he felt, as he stated in a recent MWN cover story, that he "could do more by staying on in the House as chairman of my committee—more for the people of my state and the country and perhaps the world."

John Fogarty, you helped millions to achieve better health, you saved countless lives, and you died too soon.

M. M. GEFFEN.

JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY

When John Fogarty entered Congress in 1941, at the age of 27, his background included a high school education and 10 years as a bricklayer and union official. At his death, on 10 January, he was highly respected for his knowledge of many aspects of public health and his effectiveness in fostering medical research. He had received more than 100 awards, including many honorary degrees.

Representative Fogarty began service on the Labor and Federal Security Agency Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in 1947 and became subcommittee chairman in 1949. In the first year of his service on the subcommittee, the total budget of the National Institutes of Health was about $3 million. In the current year the NIH budget approximates $1.4 billion. Accomplishing this great expansion was not easy. Traditionally the Appropriations Committee seeks to hold down expenditures. Often Fogarty placed his career in jeopardy by clashing with the committee chairman, then Clarence Cannon.

Fogarty never wavered in his belief in the value of medical research, and he fostered its expansion with single-minded zeal. His resources included great energy and unusual political sagacity. Reports of the hearings of his subcommittee reveal a master craftsman at work patiently building an extraordinarily good case for expanded support of medical research. In his efforts Fogarty had an effective partner in Senator Lister Hill. On occasions when House leadership succeeded in thwarting Fogarty, Senator Hill obtained support for increased appropriations in the Senate. Other important allies were James Shannon (director of NIH), Mary Lasker, and the medical research community. Possessing a combination of charm, brains, energy, and money, Mrs. Lasker has had access to all recent Presidents and can mobilize important support for medical research. From the medical community Fogarty could depend on such well-known expert witnesses as Paul Dudley White, Karl Menninger, Sidney Farber, and Michael De Bakey.

Fogarty built skillfully and well. He understood the vital relationship between the support of fundamental science and practical objectives. He built for permanence. His methodical care year after year won for him and the programs he fostered broad support in Congress. The *Congressional Record* for 19 January 1967 provides an indication of the respect he enjoyed. Tributes to him by more than 100 of his colleagues are recorded there. Many of the words of praise are devoted to the enduring value of his efforts in expanding medical research.

There is considerable sentiment in Congress to implement an idea that Fogarty advanced in September 1963:

"I should like to see a plan to bring into being at Bethesda a great international center for research in biology and medicine dedicated to international cooperation and collaboration in the interests of the health of mankind as so boldly envisaged by the President. This center would encompass conference facilities, laboratory and study space, and living quarters to permit the assembly for discussion, study, and research of the outstanding health scientists of the world. I visualize this center associated with the great facilities of the National Institutes of Health and the National Library of Medicine as representing the visible and tangible embodiment of this Nation's devotion to the use of science for peaceful purposes and the good of mankind."

Congressman Laird (R–Wis.), on 18 January 1967, spoke for many Congressmen (and scientists) when he stated, "I can think of no more fitting and lasting tribute to this great humanitarian than the establishment by this Congress of such a center—the John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences. Not only will such an institution be a living embodiment of the spirit and aspirations of John Fogarty, but it will serve a needed and valuable role in securing the progress of science in the cause of the well being of all mankind."

PHILIP H. ABELSON.

AS WE REMEMBER OUR CONGRESSMAN, JOHN E. FOGARTY

(By the children of St. Philip School, Grades one and two)

GRADE ONE

John E. Fogarty: He fought in World War II. He helped poor people. He helped build homes for poor people. He worked in Washington. He helped us. He helped children. He lived in Rhode Island. I will pray for him.

PETER COOGAN.

John E. Fogarty: John Fogarty is big. He went to church. He worked in Washington. We all loved him. I will pray for him.

CLAIRE CAVANAGH.

John E. Fogarty: He helped build laboratories. He was a good Congressman. We love you for helping the poor people. I hope he is in heaven. I will pray for you.

JAMES POWERS.

John E. Fogarty: He helped sick people. John E. Fogarty was a big man. He helped the schools. He did good for the people. He helped our State.

LORI LABADIE.

John E. Fogarty: I loved him. He was an important man. He helped build places. We pray for him.

CATHERINE SIEDZIK.

John E. Fogarty: He was an important man. He helped build houses for the poor people. He helped the poor people in Rhode Island. He was a nice man. I will pray for him.

WILLIAM WALKER.

John E. Fogarty: He helped the poor people. He worked in Washington. He was nice to others. He built schools. I loved him.

MICHAEL CORRAO.

John E. Fogarty: He liked to help people. He helped to build schools. He helped poor people. He was nice to others. He loved us. I hope God will help him. I will pray for him.

SUZANNE CULLEN.

John E. Fogarty: He helped build hospitals and he helped build schools. He was a good man. I loved him. I will pray for him.

MADONNA CAHILL.

John E. Fogarty. He helped the sick. He worked for others. He helped build some schools. He worked in Washington. He helped children. I will pray for him.

BARBARA PLACIDO.

John E. Fogarty: He worked in Washington. I loved him. He helped poor people. He helped other people.

SUSAN HARRISON.

John E. Fogarty: He was a big important man. He helped other people. He built schools for R.I. I loved Congressman Fogarty. He was in World War II. We hope he went to Heaven. We will pray for him.

KEVIN OATES.

John E. Fogarty: He helped the poor. He was a good man. He loved us. He worked in Washington.

FRANK MANSI.

GRADE 2

Dear Mrs. Fogarty: I know you are sad and everything. But we are sorry and we hate to hear it. We all love you. And that's how it goes. We are very very sorry. And that's how God want it to be.

LORI PAOLANTONIO.

Dear Mrs. Fogarty: I know you feel sad but I do too. I know it is your man the flag is at half mast because our lawmaker died three weeks today. I loved him very much. I know you did too. You loved him much more then I did. Good-by for now.

SUSAN REALL.

Dear Mrs. Fogarty: I know how you feel with your family. I know he was a Congressman and he loved you too. And I loved him very much. I saw him on T.V. and I like you too Mrs. Fogarty.

SUZANNE DEMERS.

Congressman Fogarty: Dear Bill, Frank, Mary, and Charles, I know your uncle was first a bricklayer. I loved him. He loved the sick and poor. I see the flag at half mast. That shows our (con) country is sad. John E. Fogarty was a good honest man.

LISA GIBBONS.

John E. Fogarty: John E. Fogarty helped the sick and poor. We all loved him because he helped all the people in the world. We are all sorry that he died. We did not want him to die.

PAMELA WOJCIECHOWSKI.

Dear Mrs. Fogarty: I will never forget when John died. I loved him very much. The flag is half mast. It is sad for us.

CHERYL DIONNE.

Dear Mrs. Fogarty: I feel sad for your husband. I know you and the family feel very sad. He was a good Congressman. He helped the sick and the poor. He died for our country. The flag is at half mast.

Love,

MARY LYONS.

Dear Mrs. Fogarty: I feel very sorry for your husband who died. And I also feel sad for you and all the famiy. I will remember you in my prayers. I see the flag at half mast so I'll remember you and your husband.

PATRICIA MONAHAN.

Dear Mrs. Fogarty: I prayed for your husband dying. He is a Congressman. He prayed for sick people.

He worked in Washington, D.C. The flag is at half mast and I am sad for his wife. He loves the poor.

JOANNE BEAUDRY.

Dear Mrs. Fogarty: I know you and your family are very sad. J.E.F. was a Congressman. He loved the sick and poor. The flag is at half mast because John E. Fogarty died. Everyone is said because J.E.F. died. He died for our country.

SHARON CHAKUROFF.

John E. Fogarty: John E. Fogarty was a nice man. He helped the sick and the poor people for health of our country. John E. Fogarty helped the people in Washington, D.C. John E. Fogarty was a Congressman of the United States of America.

ROBERT CULLEN.

Dear Mrs. Fogarty: I hope you pray for him. I hope you pray for him all the time. I hope your husband, John E. Fogarty, goes up to heaven. He helped the sick people and he helped the poor people.

LINDA BENCK.

John E. Fogarty: John E. Fogarty has died. I am sorry for his wife and family. The flag is at half mast. I saw him in the newspaper. He was a good Congressman. I will pray for him.

DANIEL SMITH.

John E. Fogarty died for our country. He worked in Washington, D.C. I see the flag half mast every day. I am sad he died.

SANDRA CARBERRY.

John E. Fogarty: Congressman Fogarty was a lawmaker. He worked all over the world. He prayed every day because he loved the sick. He worked in Washington, D.C. We have the flag half mast at St. Philip School.

PATRICIA WOJCIECHOWSKI.

John E. Fogarty: I know you are a lawmaker of U.S.A. and everybody is sad because they see the flag flying half way on the pole and they are sad because (then) they know that John E. Fogarty died. And I am very sad too for John E. Fogarty. And we know that he died for our country.

JOHN GILSON.

Dear Mrs. Fogarty: I love Congressman Fogarty, very much. The flag is half mast for you. the class prayed for him. He was a lawmaker in Washington D.C. He died for the country. He helped the poor and the sick.

PATRICIA MERCIER.

Dear Mrs. Fogarty: The flag is still at half mast at St. Philip School. We are sad. All grades are sad. I love you very much I am very sorry that your husband died. Everyone must be sorry too. Love,

DEBORAH MCVEY.

John E. Fogarty: John E. Fogarty, the Congressman who worked in Washington, D.C. He loved the poor. He died three weeks ago. Since then the flag was half mast. He was a lawmaker for the U.S.A.

MARIE PICARD.

Dear Mrs. Fogarty, I know you feel sad. He worked in Washington D.C. as I know. We talk about him in school. He helped the sick and the poor.

TRACY LAVOD.

Our Congressman John E. Fogarty was a fine man. He died three weeks ago. The flag is at half mast. He was a lawmaker. He worked in Washington, D.C. I feel sorry for his wife and all the family. How sad I felt when he died.

LINDA SACHUK.

"Doctor John": I wish John E. Fogarty did not die because he was a lawmaker. My family knows John E. Fogarty. When he died they put the flag at half mast.

RAYMOND OLIVER.

John E. Fogarty I saw John E. Fogarty in the newspaper. John E. Fogarty was a Congressman. He worked for Rhode Island. His wife is sad. He loved the sick and poor. When someone like J.E.F. dies the flag is half mast.

PHILIP OCTEAU.

Dear Mrs. Fogarty: I'll remember your husband in my prayers. The flag is at half mast. I am sorry he had to die now. He was a lawmaker for U.S.A. I am very, very sad. All Rhode Island is very sad, too.

PRISCILLA MURPHY.

Mr. Fogarty: John E. Fogarty was a grand person. He worked hard and helped the sick. He also did a lot of good for the retarded children. He was everyone's friend and I will miss him a lot. He made his record true.

KAREN DRISCOLL.

GRADE 3

Congressman Fogarty: John E. Fogarty was a great man. He always helped the poor, the sick, and he collected money to build homes for the children that had no brains. Besides helping the poor he was a holy man. He went to church every Sunday. He never missed Mass.

He served his country well. John Fogarty was in World War Two. When Congressman Fogarty died many people felt sad. We know there is no other man like him. John Fogarty died by heart attack. He died a happy life. He loved God. May he rest in peace.

PETER DAVEY.

John E. Fogarty: John Fogarty was a good man. John went to church every Sunday. He served our country in World War II. He made new laws. John's best hobby was raising money for new hospitals. He always helped the poor. We lost a great man. We need more men like John. Good bye John. Oh Lord let him lay in peace.

THOMAS RAIMONDO.

John E. Fogarty: John E. Fogarty was a wonderful man. Besides being a wonderful man, he was a wonderful Catholic. He was always interested in retarded children, and poor children. When our beloved Congressman died, the flag was set at half mast. That reminds us about our beloved Congressman. I hope he will rest in peace.

JANE CAVANAGH.

John E. Fogarty: John E. Fogarty was very good to the poor, the sick and the old. He was good to children too. John was a man of God. He went to church on Sundays and on Holy days.

Congressman Fogarty fought for our country in World War II.

Dear God bless him and bring him to Heaven with You.

CHERYL PLACIDO.

GRADE 4

John E. Fogarty

J—John E. Fogarty was a wonderful person.
O—Oh! how he helped our country.
H—He helped everyone he could.
N—No one disliked him.
E.—Everyone owes a debt to him.
F—Friends, he had many of them.
O—Oh! how we all love him.
G—God bless him now and forever.
A—A special prayer for him.
R—Remember him I will always.
T—To him I am thankful for help.
Y—Young and old we all will remember him always.

SUZANNE PAYETTE.

Fogarty

F—Is for his friendship with other men.
O—Is for how obedient he was.
G—Is for the good he did.
A—Is for all his work with the retarded.
R—Is for us to remember him.
T—Is for being true to everyone.
Y—Is for all those years he put into his work.

John E. Fogarty did a lot for our state, and our country. It's sad we lost him, but I'm sure he has a happy home in heaven with God!

KAREN GILL.

John E. Fogarty

J—He brought joy to people.
O—His outstanding deeds.
H—His honesty, charity, care.
N—His nobleness of heart.
E.—Everlastingly faithfulness towards his program.
F—His faithfulness towards the retarded.
O—His obedience to God and his country.
G—His gratefulness towards Rhode Island.
A—Assisting the aged.
R—His religious life.
T—He tried the best he could.
Y—His interest in youth.

JUDITH HARRISON.

F—Fogarty's name will never be forgotten.
O—Often he helped the sick.
G—Great Congressman Fogarty had a wonderful way with people.
A—Always working for health, education, and welfare.
R—Representing this great little state.
T—Thoughtful and kind his whole life through.
Y—Yes—this man was truly a Christian.

THOMAS PELOQUIN.

Fogarty

F—Faithfulness
O—Opportunity
G—Goodness
A—Advancement
R—Religious
T—Truthfulness
Y—Youth

Congressman Fogarty was a very intelligent, kind, willing man. He wanted to get people to help him pay for the doctor and medicine bills for the poor people who couldn't afford to pay. He always had a friendly smile for all men, women and children. He did just what God wanted all men to do to think of his neighbor. People will never forget what a good and wonderful man he was. God must surely have taken him into heaven.

DEBBIE GIBBONS.

Congressman Fogarty: Congressman Fogarty was my Uncle. He went to Congress when he was twenty-seven years old. He served there twenty-six years. He was fourteenth in seniority out of four hundred thirty-five Congressmen. He served under four different Presidents and was a close personal friend of President Kennedy. He was proud of his Irish background and to symbolize it he wore a green bow tie which later became his trademark. He was known in Rhode Island as everybody's Congressman and in the country as Mr. Public Health.

MARTHA FOGARTY.

John E. Fogarty: My uncle was John E. Fogarty. He served in Congress for twenty-six years. He died a few hours before he was to be sworn into the ninetieth Congress. I knew him very well. He was my Godfather. He used to take my cousins and me for jeep rides on Sundays. We had fun with him. Sometimes he threw footballs to us. We saw him on Sundays and had a lot of fun!

RAYMOND FOGARTY.

There was a great man. His name was John E. Fogarty. He loved everything and everyone. John E. Fogarty helped the people that had something wrong with their mind. He made the world strong and then God took John E. Fogarty to Him. John E. Fogarty was a great loss to the world and us. It was sad seeing him lowered into his grave. He made our world strong and healthy. Now he is dead but we must keep our world strong the same way as he did. He started it and we must try to keep it that way forever.

JOSEPH OATES.

JOHN E. FOGARTY

"John E."

J—is for justice
O—is for our Congressman
H—is for honest
N—is for nice
E—is for eager

HELEN BANSPACH.

Our country, as well as his family, faced a great loss when Congressman Fogarty was called by God. He was a great man as well as simple man. Others always came first with John and he did something about it. He showed this in his love and the help he gave to the retarded children. One man I admire and would like to grow up like, would be John Fogarty.

RICHARD SIEDZIK.

GRADE 5

Congressman Fogarty: Congressman Fogarty was a great man. He was loyal to his country. He wanted to help in any way he could. He was always willing to help the retarded children. It was a great shock to hear the awful news about Congressman Fogarty's death. He was a great loss to our country.

MARGARET O'NEILL.

John Fogarty: He died at the age of fifty-three,
He was very close to you and me,
If you ask me who was he,
I'd simply answer Fogarty.

MARJORIE SMITH.

A GREAT MAN

Congressman Fogarty, yes, I know,
He was the best Congressman you could ever know,
He helped colored people to flourish and progress,
And always showed up at his congress,
He was always ready to help the poor,
And he never was a real bore,
He talked a lot to help the city,
He died too soon and it was a pity,
Now I hope you will remember him,
And please don't walk off to the gym.
Remember him in prayer and thought,
A spiritual bouquet you should have bought.

ROBERT LYONS.

Congressman John Fogarty: Congressman Fogarty was my Uncle. He didn't seem like a Congressman. He just seemed like my other Uncles. On Sundays he would take us on jeep rides in the woods. One day my brother Charles and my Uncle were going on a jeep ride in the fields. When they hit a bump and my brother fell off. Another day when I was not on the jeep my Uncle went over a brush pile and could not get off. Then the jeep started on fire. Other Sundays he would play football with us. We had good times with my Uncle. I know we will remember him in our prayers. I hope he has a seat next to God.

PAUL FOGARTY.

Mr. John E. Fogarty: John Fogarty was a great man, He had such a wonderful plan; To try to help the poor and the needy, This great man was never greedy. To aid the aged and the ills, Was his unselfish aim and will. "Mr. Public Health" was his name, This was his claim to world wide fame.

MARCIA BRADBURY.

GRADE 6

J—is for justice that he loved
O—is for outstanding Congressman
H—is for the honors he received
N—is for the navy in which he served
E—is for excellence with which he did everything
F—is for the faith he had in others
O—is for outstanding statesman that he was
G—is for the good deeds he did
A—is for America, the country he loved
R—is for respect that he received
T—is for trustworthy—that's what he was
Y—is for the youth centers that he established

THOMAS SHORT.

John E. Fogarty Was:
Just
Open-minded
Humble
Nice
Fair
Obliging
Grateful
Active
Reasonable
Truthful
Youthful

STEVEN AVERILL.

John E. Fogarty: This great humble man, John E. Fogarty, "Everybody's Congressman," went down the path of life doing good for everyone he met. He served in Congress for twenty-six years, trying hard not to accept a pat on the back or congratulations. In those years he truly lived up to the title, "A Man of the People." Congressman Fogarty will remain in the minds and hearts of everyone for many years to come.

PAULA CAVANAGH.

"Everybody's Congressman": On January 10, 1967 Congressman John E. Fogarty left his beloved country, friends, and relatives. But deep in our hearts nothing can erase the memories of this humble congressman. To everyone he was a great loss, to those who knew him personally, and even to those who never met him. Most people will remember him for his outstanding work with the mentally retarded.

He took much time and effort to aid the retarded by making their lives easier to endure. In our hearts for the rest of our lives will linger the memories of John E. Fogarty known to all as "Everybody's Congressman."

MARTHA HARRISON.

GRADE 7

John E. Fogarty: In the life of a youngster, many things happen, some menial and petty, but others meaningful and important . . . In the Declaration of Independence it says that all men are created equal. Behind this, I believe, lies a promise, a promise that has been fulfilled many times, by many people—A few weeks ago, a person fulfilled this promise once again—Before a cold gray gravestone a person knelt. When he arose, he said, "Well, too bad he died, he certainly was a nice guy." He walked away, and that was that. An encounter with nobody, actually. I don't know why it has to be this way, but that's the way it is. The man should not of been there, really, because he was praying at the graveside of a man who had wanted to talk and listen to everybody. The name on the gravestone—John E. Fogarty. With a big Irish grin on his face, nearly every day he'd board a plane, a massive silver plane which would fly up to the sky and back again. That was, in short, John Fogarty's life. He flew to the sky and back again. He majored, I suppose in helping others. He was the epitome of an Irish-American, but he was the representative of all peoples. You can't picture Mr. Fogarty in a white toga and mantle, with a halo on his head, but if he is in Heaven, I hope that his work-hewn hands will reach down and bless us all.

ANN CONWAY.

A Well Respected Man: Known to all as a humble man he served in politics for over twenty years. As a youth he was a leader of his society, and until twenty-seven years had passed he had not been anything except a brick-layer. In my eyes he is what you would call an ideal person. His life was full of happiness for in helping the sick you always get a satisfied feeling. He was always saying cheerful words to all as if his supply of happiness and love of neighbor would never diminish. For the rest of my life I will never forget John E. Fogarty the most respected man I have ever known.

MARK CAVANAGH.

Congressman John E. Fogarty (1913–1967): Tuesday, January 10, was a very mournful day for all Americans. It was sorrowful because it was the day our beloved Congressman John E. Fogarty passed away in Washington, D.C. Congressman Fogarty was liked by all people, not only for his untiring work in the field of mental health, but also for his marvelous personality, and Irish sense of humor.

John Fogarty did many outstanding deeds for the unfortunate people of our State, among these were having laws passed through our legislature. Because of his many kind deeds, Rhode Island has named one of its health centers in honor of him. I'm sure Congressman Fogarty will be remembered through Rhode Island history as a truly great man.

Congressman Fogarty, a member of Congress for the past 27 years was, I'm sure, very popular among the other Representatives of our country. He was a close associate to the President of the United States, and even known across seas for his many deeds. Truly John Fogarty was a man who would have never been beaten for the seat in the House, and the sure fact of him being in Congress for 27 years is proof enough of him being known as everyone's Congressman.

ROBERT HARRISON.

Congressman John Fogarty: On Tuesday January 10, 1967, a great tragedy hit the nation. It was on this day we in Greenville lost a dear friend and neighbor, but the nation lost a great statesman Congressman John E. Fogarty. Congressman Fogarty labored long and hard for the good of humanity, his help for the retarded children shows this. Although he held a high office, he still remained humble. Because of his great efforts, the fields of medicine and education have been greatly advanced. Surely it will be difficult to find another to replace Congressman John E. Fogarty.

CAROLYN VACCA.

Congressman John E. Fogarty: John E. Fogarty was born in Providence in 1913. Elected for the first time in 1940, he served Rhode Island and our nation for twenty-six years. During this time he accomplished more good on earth than anyone I know. He stood out as a great man not only because of his title but also because of his tremendous humility. Awards and merits had their place in his life but his great concern for those not as fortunate as he came first and foremost. A familiar sight around Greenville and Washington was John Fogarty wearing his famous green bow tie.

Surely, such a great and holy man is a saint in heaven today.

THERESA GIBBONS.

Congressman Fogarty (1913–1967): Congressman John E. Fogarty was a respected man throughout our country. He was very humble although he really was a great man. He was concerned with the unfortunate people in Rhode Island and in the United States. Everyone mourned on January 10, 1967 when the congressman died. Flags were flown at half-mast throughout the country. His funeral was held at the Cathedral in Providence. The Mass was said by Bishop McVinney. Many high officials were present at his funeral, including Hubert H. Humphrey, the vice president. Congressman John E. Fogarty is one great congressman whom we, the people of the United States, will not forget.

LINDA ZANGARI.

Congressman John E. Fogarty, (1913–1967): John E. Fogarty was truly a respected man throughout our country. He helped the handicapped people in R.I. Only thinking of our state, he wanted it to be a safe place to live in. On January 10, 1967 flags were flown at half mast. His dying on this day (January 10) was truly a great loss to not only our state but to our country and the world.

At his funeral, three days later, were many famous people, the vice president of the United States, and others including his wife, daughter, and relatives. His death brought mourners from all over our country paying honor and tribute to him.

ANN SHORT.

Congressman John E. Fogarty (1913–1967): Fogarty was born in the town of Harmony in 1913. He served in politics for twenty-six years. He was a chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee handling health, education and welfare matters. Fogarty was a credit to politics. He was loved and respected by everyone in all walks of life. He was a just and equal man and lead a life of holiness. Fogarty was a great loss to humanity. He died on January tenth 1967 a day that can always be remembered by all citizens of the home state of Rhode Island.

SHARON CARDARELLI.

Everybodys Congressman: John E. Fogarty, 1913–1967, born in Harmony, R.I., has spent over half of his life in the service of mankind. It was through this service that he won national fame and honors. But these meant nothing to him for he was a humble man. He was never afraid to take advice from anyone. He strived to help the common man, the crippled, and retarded to a better life. It was through this work that he won the title, "Everybody's Congressman." He is gone but his memory still remains.

MICHAEL KIELY.

John E. Fogarty, 1913–January 10, 1967:
*J*ust—in his work.
*O*pen—in his thought.
*H*eroic—in his deed.
*N*oble—in his work.
*E*ager—to serve his country.
*F*ull-time devotion to others.
*O*ld—a time in live he was concerned for.
*G*ay—approach to problems large or small.
*A*lways—willing to lend a helping hand.
*R*apid—help for those in need.
*T*ruly—a sincere servant.
*Y*earning—to help less fortunate.

DONNA HASSELL.

A Tribute to John Fogarty

The man I knew not personally.
But respected all the same.
Who led the charge for all in U.S.A. in the battle for health education and welfare.

We are deeply shocked by the sudden death of our lifelong friend.

Hats off to John E. Fogarty a leader we will never forget.

MARYANN LECLERC.

John E. Fogarty: John Fogarty served in Congress for over twenty-five years. During that time he has made great donations to medical centers and many other things. He was a friend of the people. Mr. Fogarty was respected throughout the nation. During his lifetime he received many awards. In Washington he would do everything possible to help the people of Rhode Island in many ways. He helped the retarded children by building hospitals. When he died in Washington everyone was shocked. He was one of the greatest statesmen ever.

GARRY PELOQUIN.

GRADE 8

What I Knew About John E. Fogarty

It was a cool breezy summer day and the waves on Waterman's Lake were almost white-capped.

Ahead of me was my friend pedaling along with a sack full of papers dangling from his bicycle. Soon we were riding along the winding Philips Lane where we halted frequently to deliver papers. We stopped at one house and we walked up to the door and rang the bell. The door opened and a husky man with a big smile on his face greeted us and paid for his paper. He then waved good-by as we hopped on our bikes and left.

That was the first but not the last time I ever saw Congressman Fogarty. The next year I saw him at the Father's Day Breakfast where he gave a short talk. I frequently saw him after that at early mass and as usual he was smiling.

When I heard of his death I was very sorry and no one can ever take his place. When I watched the memorial to him on television I really realized then what a great man he was. He always worked for the people's good and helped many people with their problems. Now he's gone but his works will continue to help the needy.

RICHARD GILL.

John E. Fogarty: The last time I saw the congressman was at a family party. He seemed so relaxed and happy. He gave rides in his red jeep through the woods. The next time I saw him he lay at rest.

He was a great man starting out as a bricklayer and ending up as a renowned congressman is a great feat.

As most people know, John Fogarty was Irish. His symbol was a green bow tie. He was "Everybody's Congressman," especially the sick and mentally ill. Because of this hard-working congressman we now have Fogarty Center and the Fogarty Building at U.R.I. And very soon a building is to be dedicated to him at the National Health Institute.

Mr. Fogarty was showered with many honors, but he really never gave much thought to them. He knew there was too much to be done and too little time in which to do it. Thirteen years ago he suffered a severe heart attack and was given three years to live. So he knew he was living on borrowed time.

We have much to be thankful for because of this loyal statesman, John Edward Fogarty.

MARY ELLEN KRILY.

A Tribute to John E. Fogarty

Congressman Fogarty was a wonderful man. During his lifetime he did many useful things some of which were: helping the mentally retarded, giving assistance to older people, and giving many dollars worth of aid to help boost the world of medicine.

Never before has a man of so many virtues been known to Congress. Not only was he a devout Catholic but also a patient, loving and understanding man. Although the virtues just mentioned are very rare in most people he had one virtue rarer than any of these; his constant concern for the health and welfare of others.

When Congressman Fogarty died, the whole nation lost a great man. There was much grief in the U.S. when the news of his death spread. I'm sure he will be remembered in the prayers of many people in days to come.

MARIA PASCONE.

In Memory of a Congressman

Congressman Fogarty was one whom many a person knew,
He was a great man in our government and we trusted him too.
He was the type of man we would always need,
And when he talked we gave him much heed.
To me he was a brave soldier carrying his cross,
And to many when he died a political loss.
A man whose famous memory will forever remain,
A starlight to everyone with never a stain;
A life long admirer of both young and old,
A tale to tell of his heart of gold.

VIVIAN WEAVER.

John E. Fogarty—A Good Christian: Everyone remembers Congressman John Edward Fogarty as a loyal statesman who worked for better health and welfare throughout the U.S. especially in his own state, Rhode Island. But how many citizens remember Congressman Fogarty as a simple man—a good Christian following the path of God? I remember him as this. So do many other people. I remember sitting in back of John Fogarty and his wife and daughter at mass on Sunday in St. Philip Church many times. The Lord said, "He who humbles himself shall be exalted." Congressman Fogarty did exactly this.

MARIE A. MAINELLI.

Mr. Public Health: His twenty-six years of dedicated service in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States merited for him national acclaim and the established reputation as "the champion of better health for the nation." John Fogarty was a man who sought no trophies of his own but for the victories he helped to win against poverty, ignorance, disease and the waste of human resources. Mr. Fogarty looked to me like a family man: a friend you could trust in a need of help. But most of all he tried to be a friend to all colors and religions. John E. Fogarty in years to come will be a famous man for all to look to. He probably will be remembered for his great works in the field of Mental retardation. He did not go to college like the rest of our congressmen but it was realized he was one of the smartest men that ever served in congress. His formal education ended when he received his high school diploma. Then he became a brick layer like his father and brother. His death as the Pawtucket Valley Times said that Rhode Island has lost one of its most distinguished citizens. He was Everybody's Congressman and he served everyone to the best of his ability in Washington.

RICHARD MERCIER.

Congressman John Fogarty: Three weeks ago the nation and state lost a wonderful and remarkable man.

Congressman Fogarty had contributed so much to our nation's people, especially in the field of medicine. He worked endlessly for the unfortunate retarded. This is one of the important things he is remembered for.

Congressman Fogarty was an outstanding example of a good Christian. His strive was to help people. He was very humble with his work, never looking for praise. Charity was another virtue he openly and always possessed.

Congressman Fogarty was well liked by many throughout the state and nation. He had a good sense of humor, and always had a smile on his face.

Undoubtedly, Congressman Fogarty will be rewarded in heaven for his charitable work on earth.

FRANCES VACCA.

A Tribute To John E. Fogarty: The state of Rhode Island lost a great friend and congressman in the passing of Representative John E. Fogarty. During his twenty-six years as a representative in Congress, his guiding hand has resulted in many benefits for the people in his home state in the areas of health, education, and welfare. Although not everyone knew him personally, even school children recognized the green bow tie as the trademark of John E. Fogarty. He was called "Mr. Public Health" because of his untiring efforts in that field. The citizens of Rhode Island mourned the passing of this great man just as the nation and the world mourned the passing of President Kennedy and Pope John XXIII.

DEBORAH BROSSEAU.

A Tribute to Him: Congressmen Fogarty was the most humble man I've ever met. The times that I met him were only short but in that time I saw truly a great and modest man.

He lived for the people of his state and for his country. He did so much good for the mentally retarded children that I couldn't begin to tell you. Because of all his great works he'll be long remembered in the hearts and minds of generations to come.

He never wanted to be made a fuss over. When he and his family came to their parish church he was just another parishioner. In his beautiful home on Philips Lane in Harmony he led a very easy life but when he went to work for his beloved country he would work for hours at a time.

From a humble bricklayer he gained all the knowledge his mind could hold with not even a college degree. From the first day he entered into politics he lived up to his worthy position.

Truly Congressman Fogarty was the greatest man I've ever met and it was an honor knowing him.

STEVEN SEMMA.

John E. Fogarty: I watched this great man as he cut the ribbon opening a new, modern hospital for the benefit of the retarded children. I was young at the time and I didn't really know who he was or why he was opening the hospital. A few years later I learned who he was and that he had worked very hard for the building of that hospital. I realized then how great this man was to devote his life to underprivileged children. I grew to honor and respect this man and I was proud that I could say, "He belongs to my parish." In his 26 years as a congressman, he accomplished more than most people do in a lifetime. His death was mourned by people all over the country and the world. His time had come and no tears could bring him back, but he will never die in the hearts of many Americans.

PAUL LYONS.

John Edward Fogarty: Mr. Fogarty served under five different presidents in his twenty-six years as a congressman. The presidents were F. D. Roosevelt 1933–1945, Truman 1945–1953, Eisenhowever 1953–1961, Kennedy 1961–1963, Johnson 1963–. John Edward Fogarty was an Irishman with a good sense of humor. His political symbol was a green bow tie to represent his country Ireland. Mr. Fogarty was a Seabee in the navy before he became a congressman. He had only one

child Mary. Mary and her mother are now moving from their home on Philips Lane in Harmony, to Washington, D.C. The late congressman did a lot for the mentally retarded children. He started an institution for them. I think Mr. Fogarty should be and will be remembered statewide for his great acts.

BEVERLY LACHAPELLE.

John E. Fogarty (1913–67): John E. Fogarty was a real friend to everyone who he was known to. He never complained about anything and always being humble about his position in office, he never bragged or boasted about himself among others. He would act as any other person would when he went anywhere. Every Sunday he would attend the same Mass and walk in and out casually minding his own business not trying to make himself be recognized by everyone as someone special. He was always considerate to needy children and found a new hope for many retarded children. Three weeks ago thousands of people shared the sadness of the loss of John Fogarty who was like a wonderful friend to everyone. If we could have done and achieved every thought John Fogarty had thought of to help someone in need it would take us a century to do so. I think it's good to remind ourselves that John Fogarty was a good American citizen to follow because he always thought of helping someone else first before helping himself. Everyone who knew John Fogarty should be proud of what he has done for everybody through his kindness.

EDWARD LAPRADE.

The Outstanding Life of a Congressman: Congressman Fogarty was a very charitable man with a personality that made any one like him the moment they came into contact with him. He played a wonderful role in the history of our nation and in the history of politics. The whole nation grieved when they heard about the death of this extraordinary man. They all knew that our country would never be the same without him. He was just to begin his 27th year at the opening of the 90th congress.

He did better than many Congressmen who had a college education for he did not. Before he was elected to Congress he was just a simple bricklayer.

He did many good works for people less fortunate than he and especially for the mentally retarded. For this, many places for these people were named after him. He was so concerned with the health of our nation he often said that he wondered why we were spending so much money to get men on the moon and we didn't even know what made the human body tick. I am sure that many people including myself will never forget such a wonderful and generous man.

SHEILA PILOQUIN.

John E. Fogarty: On the morning of January 10, 1967, the intercom blurted out that our Congressman John Fogarty had died in his Washington office this morning. Then thoughts began going through my mind, thoughts on how John Fogarty had helped so many people. I also thought how "Everybody's Congressman" had helped so many mentally disturbed children.

In his twenty-six years in Congress Mr. Fogarty did much great work. But by being the modest man he was you rarely heard his name mentioned with the deed. On that fateful day our country lost one of its great men.

FRANCIS KAYATTAL.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD additional eulogies on my colleague and close friend, the late JOHN E. FOGARTY.

Included in these eulogies is one by JOHN FOGARTY'S nephew, Edward M. Fogarty.

These testimonies to the greatness of JOHN FOGARTY should be recorded and not left to pass without notice.

The material follows:

The fact that John Edward Fogarty was my uncle has always been for me a source of great pride. Each time his name was mentioned in conversation, each time I heard of his receiving yet another honor, each time he was reelected to Congress by an overwhelming margin, I could feel pride rise within me. Today that pride is probably greater than ever. I, along with the other members of his family, have always known that he was a great man. Yet it has been since his death that I have come to realize just how many people from all walks of life, and from all parts of the nation and the world, share in this realization. The tributes, eulogies, and laments that have poured forth from every direction are demonstrative of the fact that he will never be forgotten.

My most vivid memory of my uncle will be that of a typical Sunday in Harmony, Rhode Island. For as far back as I can remember, the Fogarty's have gathered every Sunday morning after Mass at the Fogarty homestead. Uncle John was there every Sunday. He sat quietly, listening to everything that was said. He could easily have dominated the conversation, since when he spoke everyone listened. Yet, he was always willing to take a back seat. This is the kind of man he was. He never praised himself nor sought attention. He never had to. People knew his accomplishments, and they respected and admired him for them and for being the kind of man he was.

John E. Fogarty dedicated his life to the betterment of the world, in an effort to make the lives of people everywhere a little less difficult. His was a crusade to wipe out disease, ignorance and hardship. Education owes him a great debt of gratitude for all he did to bring institutions of learning the best tools available. His work was a major factor in the appropriation of millions of dollars for educational advancement. Doctor Howard A. Rush wrote in the *New York Times* after my uncle's death: "No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty." What more can be said of John Fogarty's efforts in the field of health? The project which was dearest to him, the one to which he most poured out his sympathies and energies, was the fight against mental disease, and particularly mental retardation. At the time when John Fogarty took up this banner, the fight was indeed limited. As a direct result of his efforts, the money and facilities used in combatting mental illness have been multiplied multifold in the last two decades. On February 2, 1964, John Fogarty received what was certainly one of the greatest and most cherished tributes paid to him during his lifetime—the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation 1963 International Award in the field of Mental Retardation.

John E. Fogarty was the recipient of many awards and honors during his lifetime. On February 3, 1966, President Johnson presented my uncle with another of these—the American Heart Association's 1966 Heart of the Year Award. On January 10, 1967, this heart failed John Fogarty, ending the remarkable career of a remarkable man.

The little people of the world—the mentally ill, the chronically ill, the aged, the poor—owe John Fogarty a great debt. Yes, all of us owe him a great deal. We, his family, mourn his passing with leaden hearts. Yet he will be missed not only by his family, not only by his friends and colleagues, but by more people than we will ever realize. John Edward Fogarty has left his mark in the world. He will always be remembered. I will always look upon his memory with great pride—Representative John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island, Everybody's Congressman, my uncle.

EDWARD M. FOGARTY.

STATEMENT BY DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN JOHN M. BAILEY ON THE DEATH OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY OF RHODE ISLAND

The sudden passing of Congressman John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island will be felt as a great void among those in our country who care about the health and welfare of people everywhere.

As an individual, Congressman Fogarty believed that his government should care about people who lacked access to good health and adequate opportunity. As Chairman of the Congressional subcommittee that appropriated funds for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, he provided the leadership that gave his fellow man the opportunity to live a healthier and richer life. His only regret was that he could not do more.

Congressman Fogarty was a Democrat. He was a man of such great integrity and personal courage that he made all of us proud that he served as a member of the Democratic Party.

We shall miss his presence. But his work will live on in those millions of people who have a better life because of his outstanding efforts in the Congress.

JOHN E. FOGARTY, 1913–67

John Fogarty is dead. Were the man himself to write this notice, that is how he would state it: John Fogarty is dead. He would put it that simply, that bluntly, stripped of formality and pomp.

National politics is a complex endeavor of melding a whole range of disparate interests into a unified whole, into a formula of words that can be put on paper and enacted into law. The man who, day in and day out, undertakes such work finds himself in a world where success and failure hinge on a word that should have been spoken and wasn't or a word that shouldn't have been said and was, on the placing of a comma, the dotting of an *i*, the crossing of a *t*.

Frequently, the man finds his own personality being colored by the exigencies of his work. There is the temptation to become cautious in words and not in thought, to don a noncommittal mask that, with fine impartiality, can be shown to friend and foe alike.

John Fogarty never became such a man. Probably he was incapable of feeling the temptation. He studied the evidence, decided what was true, and then spoke out as plainly, as forcefully, and as frequently as he could. It was that simple to him, that fortunate for America.

At the core of John Fogarty's thought was the conviction that the nation did not care enough about health affairs, that the nation did not understand as fully as it ought what benefits could be reaped by a total commitment to health research, health education and health care. He expressed this conviction often, and to the degree that he could, he did something about it. As history will record, what he did was magnificent. He will need no marble statues, no dedicatory plaques. There will be instead whole generations of Americans, many not even knowing his name, to stand as the testament to the clarity of his vision and to his dedication, an unceasing dedication that finally robbed the man himself of life. This will be his monument.

[From Exceptional Children, February 1967]

The death of Representative John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island just before the 90th Congress opened was a shock to all of his

friends and particularly to those who worked with the handicapped and with the health problems of the nation. Mr. Fogarty's name has become synonymous with progress in initiating bold new ventures in health and education.

The Council for Exceptional Children expressed its appreciation for Mr. Fogarty's contributions by presenting him with this citation in June, 1965:

The Council for Exceptional Children Citation for legislative statesmanship is presented to John E. Fogarty. The many important contributions to human welfare and education which have been made by Representative J. E. Fogarty are recognized with deep appreciation by the special educators in The Council for Exceptional Children. We are most grateful for his recognition of the importance of special education in a total program for the handicapped and the gifted. His persistent efforts in the Congress to secure such benefits as the first federal categorical programs of research in special education and scholarship support for teachers of the mentally retarded have markedly advanced school programs for children with disabilities. Mr. Fogarty is a symbol of support for exceptional children, their parents, and their teachers. Through his efforts, our country has been made a more humane land for all of us.

CBS joins with President Johnson who praised Mr. Fogarty as "a great leader and an effective member of Congress . . . a major architect in the fields of health and education."

[From CARC/NEWS, January–February 1967]

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN E. FOGARTY

The mentally retarded lost a great friend when Rep. John E. Fogarty (D-R.I.), a member of the House since 1941, died January 10.

A rough-hewn, solid man who was trained as a bricklayer, he later became the business agent of the union, and soon, even as a young man, gained a reputation for his fairness, intelligence and integrity. Mr. Fogarty, who would have been 54 March 23, collapsed in his office about two hours before the start of the 90th Congress. He was first elected to Conrgess in 1940 and served until the December 7, 1941 bombing of Pearl Harbor when he resigned from Congress to join the Army. After World War II, he was reelected to the House, and had served ever since. At the time of his death, he was chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee handling health, education, and welfare matters.

From the moment he entered Congress three decades ago until the very last, Mr. Fogarty devoted himself with earnest intensity to the promotion of all measures furthering medical research, better medical care, and increased appropriations for the various governmental units that were concerned with public health. He was particularly active in promoting better care for the mentally retarded. In 1959, he received the national Albert Lasker Award for championing the advancement of medical research and public health. Part of the honorarium which accompanied the award was donated by Mr. Fogarty to the Rhode Island parents Council for Mentally Retarded Children. In his native state, with quiet affection, they usually referred to him as "Doctor" John. When told of Rep. Fogarty's death, Governor Dempsey said, "His dedication to the cause of helping the retarded will long be remembered. Here in Connecticut we are benefiting from federal programs in this field which he did much to support. I know that his loss will be keenly felt not only in his native state but throughout the country."

[From Performance, March 1967]

A TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY

(NOTE.—The following statement was issued by President's Committee Chairman Harold Russell upon the death of John E. Fogarty, Congressman from Rhode Island, January 10, 1967.)

The handicapped of America have lost a great friend and champion with the passing of Congressman Fogarty. When my predecessor, the late Chairman, Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR, Ret., in 1962 traveled to Providence, R.I., and joined with Gov. John E. Notte, Jr., in presenting Mr. Fogarty with the President's Committee award, he said, "I know of no other single person who in 2 short decades has done more for the handicapped than Mr. Fogarty."

Like John Fogarty, I, too, am 53 years old and as his true contemporary, I wish to testify along with the rest of the handicapped world that this young man accomplished a modern miracle.

I have known John Fogarty ever since World War II and his quiet modesty and calm insistence for the rights of the disabled were in direct contrast to his accomplishments in rehabilitation legislation.

A bricklayer by trade, one of the most important bricks he ever laid was the first Federal funds for research in mental retardation in 1955. Other bricks went into the solid and massive foundation of the National Institutes of Health, where 40 percent of the Nation's biomedical research is carried on today. Due in large part to his insistence, the appropriation for that agency grew from $3.5 million in 1946 to $1.5 billion currently.

Aside from bricks and mortar, however, his lasting monument is to leave our country with the clear conviction that serious disease and affliction are intolerable, and that large-scale efforts can bring progress against disability.

Let it be said of this humble tradesman, in tribute to his lasting legacy to America, that he laid his bricks straight and true.

JOHN E. FOGARTY DIES—PROMOTED FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO AID MENTALLY RETARDED

Representative John E. Fogarty, 53, Democrat of Rhode Island and a pioneer in promoting federal legislation to aid the mentally retarded, died Tuesday, January 10th, in his Washington office, apparently of a heart attack.

Mr. Fogarty, long-time friend of the National Association for Retarded Children, collapsed shortly before he was to have been sworn in for his 14th term in the House.

Tuesday night, President Johnson opened his State of the Union Message to Congress by saying, "I share with all of you the grief that you feel at the death today of one of the most beloved and respected and effective members of this body, the distinguished Representative of Rhode Island, Mr. Fogarty."

HE MADE HISTORY

History was made in the field of mental retardation in 1955 when, as a result of Mr. Fogarty's efforts, Congress appropriated $750,000 to launch a research program in mental retardation. This was the first federal legislation in behalf of the mentally retarded. From that time on Mr. Fogarty conducted a consistent drive for appropriations in support of special programs for the retarded.

His interest in mental retardation stemmed from his friendship with J. Arthur Trudeau of Rhode Island who passed away a year ago, also at the age of 53. Mr. Trudeau was a pioneer in the citizen movement in behalf of retarded children and he convinced Mr. Fogarty that a long-term program of government-sponsored research held the key to progress in mental retardation.

Mr. Fogarty became recognized as a national spokesman for medical research and for programs to aid the retarded. Today, there are 48 programs sponsored by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare providing financial assistance for research and demonstration projects, services, training, construction, income maintenance and other programs for the retarded.

Since 1949 Mr. Fogarty had served as chairman of what is now the House Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare.

In 1956 he received the first award of the National Association for Retarded Children for his effective work in Congress to promote legislation benefiting the retarded.

The NARC citation stated, "Congressman Fogarty, keenly perceptive of the great need as well as the national dimension of the problems of the mentally retarded, brought to bear his own great personal and humanitarian force as well as the influence of his office to secure effectively from the Congress of the United States of America a concrete expression of this nation's concern for the mentally retarded. Future generations will have cause to be thankful to him, for surely they will benefit from the scientific discoveries which will be made possible by research in this little known area of life."

Honored many times, Mr. Fogarty received in 1959, along with Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, one of two special Lasker awards for "extraordinary public service." He donated the accompanying $5,000 honorarium to the Rhode Island Association for Retarded Children for the development of parent counseling services.

In 1963 he received one of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation awards, and with the $8,500 grant he established the John E. Fogarty Foundation in Providence, R.I. At that time he was described as "perhaps the key figure in the mental retardation movement of the present decade."

A hospital at the Doctor Joseph H. Ladd School for the Retarded, a center for retarded children in Providence, and a health-science library building at the University of Rhode Island all bear Mr. Fogarty's name.

Mr. Fogarty is survived by his widow, the former Luise Rohland; his daughter, Mary Luise; four brothers, William, Raymond, T. Francis, and Charles Fogarty; and a sister, Miss Margaret A. Fogarty.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to submit for the RECORD the following: A preface for a reprint of the tributes and eulogies to my former colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY; a list of the many awards bestowed upon JOHN E. FOGARTY during his lifetime; and a copy of the biography of JOHN E. FOGARTY that appeared in the Congressional Directory, so imposing because of its simplicity and humility:

LIST OF AWARDS, CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY

LaSalle Alumni Association: Citation for integrity and ability in public life reflecting credit on LaSalle Academy. January 26, 1941.

Providence College: Honorary degree of Doctor of Political Science. June 10, 1946.

American Federation of Labor: Citation for continuous work in the Congress in prompting the general welfare. 1951.

American Cancer Society: Distinguished Service Award for leadership in Congress in the enactment of cancer control legislation. 1952.

National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders: Citation in appreciation for Congressman Fogarty's contribution to the health and welfare of citizens of this country. 1954.

National Association of Retired Civil Employees: Citation for support given to legislation of benefit to retired government employees. September 30, 1954.

R.I. Auto Dealers Association: Citation for legisaltive efforts of benefit to auto dealers. 1954.

R.I. Society for Crippled Children and Adults: Award of merit for work in the area research on crippling diseases. 1955.

R.I. State Federation of Post Office Clerks:

Citation for long and outstanding career in support of legislation beneficial to federal employees. 1955.

Welfare League for Retarded Children: National Award Citation and Bronze plaque for distinguished service in the field of mental retardation. November 19, 1955.

United Cerebral Palsy Association: National Distinguished Service Award for outstanding support of the cause of America's cerebral palsied. January 1, 1956.

R.I. State Dental Society: Annual Medal of Award for distinguished leadership in public health dental research. January 17, 1956.

American Vocational Association: National Award for great interest and efforts in the field of vocational education. January 28, 1956.

Children's Cancer Research Foundation: Citation of honor for courageous and far-sighted leadership in medical research bringing better health and happiness to children everywhere. 1956.

National Association for Retarded Children, Inc.: National Award of Merit for work with retarded children. April 22, 1956.

Miriam Hospital: Award of Life Membership in recognition of loyal devotion. 1956.

American Association of School Superintendents: National Award for efforts as recognized leader in the Congress on legislation of benefit to federally impacted school districts. September 1956.

Parents Magazine: Distinguished Service Medal for work on behalf of children. October 8, 1956. Award given one person in entire country each year.

Redbook Magazine: Selected as one of the Ten Outstanding Members of Congress who have done most for youth of the country. October 1956.

Benevolent Society for Retarded Children, Inc.: National Award for sponsoring beneficial legislation in field of mental retardation. November 10, 1956.

Disabled American Veterans: Awarded the Bousquet Trophy for outstanding service to disabled American veterans. December 7, 1956.

Cranston Chamber of Commerce: Citation in recognition of noteworthy and consistent efforts for the betterment of the general health. January 22, 1957.

American Vocational Association: National Award for distinguished services in the field of vocational education. April 29, 1927.

Georgetown University: Award of membership in Scholastic Honor Society of Georgetown Dental School. May 23, 1957.

American Legion Department, R.I.: Citation in Appreciation for contribution to the health and welfare of the citizens of this country. June 15, 1957.

R.I. College of Pharmacy: Honorary degree, Doctor of Science. June 12, 1957.

University of Rhode Island Alumni Association: Awarded honorary membership in the alumni association of University of Rhode Island. June 8, 1957.

American Hospital Association: Awarded honorary membership in recognition of his outstanding efforts toward the improvements of the nation's health. Atlantic City, N.J. October 2, 1957.

R.I. Hospital Association: Awarded honorary membership in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the advancement of the health and welfare of the people of this country. Providence, R.I. October 22, 1957.

American Dental Association: Awarded honorary membership in recognition of his support of research and health measures. Miami Beach, Florida. November 4, 1957.

American Public Health Association: Presidential Citation 1957 awarded for exceptional services to Public Health. This is the first citation ever given and it is intended that it will be awarded each year to the outstanding man of the country. November 11, 1957.

R.I. Association for Mental Health, Inc.: Award for work toward the improvement of the nation's health. November 14, 1957.

Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries: National Award for Good Will toward the Handicapped. Washington, D.C. February 27, 1958.

National Epilepsy League Incorporated: National Citation on behalf of persons afflicted with epilepsy. Washington, D.C. February 28, 1958.

National Conference on Social Welfare: National Conference on Social Welfare Award for 1958 in recognition of outstanding efforts. Chicago, Illinois. May 14, 1958.

National Tuberculosis Association: National Commendation for efforts, accomplishments and record of devoted public service concerning the importance of the tuberculosis problem. Philadelphia, Pa. May 19, 1958.

National representatives of Religious, Civic, Welfare, Education, Veterans, Health and Labor Organizations: Presentation of a scroll signed by each representative to express appreciation. Washington, D.C. July 29, 1958.

Maryland State Dental Association: Award in acknowledgement of valuable services in elevating the standards and advancing the Science of Dentistry. Baltimore, Maryland. May 7, 1958.

Southern New England Timing Association: Award Plaque presented in appreciation for the invaluable assistance to further drag strip racing in Rhode Island. August 3, 1958.

American Public Welfare: Highest commendation and praise for statesmanship and leadership in these areas representing the growth of the social conscience of America. Providence, R.I. September 24, 1958.

National Rehabilitation Association: President's Award for outstanding achievement in advancing the rehabilitation of the handicapped. Providence, R.I. September 24, 1958.

R. I. Conference of Social Work: Resolution in recognition of his statesmanship and leadership in the growth of the social conscience of America. December 10, 1958.

R. I. Chapter National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation: Award plaque in recognition and appreciation of his outstanding work, selflessness and devotion to the cause of humanity. Providence, R.I. January 3, 1959.

World Health Organization: Appointed by the President as Congressional Adviser to the U.S. Delegation to the WHO Assembly held in Geneva, Switzerland, May 1957, 1959 and 1962 and in New Delhi India in February, 1961.

American Rheumatism Association and Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation: Presentation of award for staunchly and devotedly supporting the cause of research and professional education in Arthritis and other Rheumatic Diseases. Washington, D. C. June 5, 1959.

American Gastroenterlogical Association and the World Organization of Gastroenterology: First Citation Award in expression of great appreciation and respect for the tremendous support not only to gastroenterology but to recognize complete dedication and expenditure of effort in a truly non-partisan sense for medical research and health for peace efforts throughout the world. Atlantic City, N.J. June 6, 1959.

University of Rhode Island: Honorary degree, Doctor of Laws. June 8, 1959.

Bryant College: Honorary degree, Doctor of Humane Letters. July 31, 1959.

American Public Health Association, Inc.: Presentation of special Lasker Award for extraordinary public service in championing the advancement of medical research and public health as a member of the United States House of Representatives at a Special Session of the 87th Annual Meeting in Atlantic City, N.J. October 22, 1959.

Council of Chief State School Officers: Presentation of distinguished service citation in recognition of his service to the children and schools of America as a leader in the Congress of the United States. Boston. November 12, 1959.

The Food Law Institute: Award for distinguished food law services to the American people. Washington, D.C. November 16, 1959.

Kiwanis Club: Honorary Member of Kiwanis International. December 9, 1959.

National Multiple Sclerosis Society: Award of Distinction for enlightened service to the fight against multiple sclerosis. December 23, 1959.

American Association of Retired Persons: Citation for service in grateful appreciation for significant and valued contributions to the enrichments of retirement living. St. Petersburg, Florida. January 18, 1960.

New York Medical College: Award of Centennial Medal. New York City. April 18, 1960.

Democratic National Committee: Testimonial Scroll to "Mr. Public Health" for contribution in Congress to the cause of medical research for the people's benefit at the Democratic Congressional Dinner District Armory, Washington, D.C. April 30, 1960.

American Psychiatric Association: Honorary Fellowship. Atlantic City, N.J. May 9, 1960.

U.S. Department of Labor: Award of Merit. Official Commendation and praise in recognition of significant and outstanding contribution toward furthering the work of the Department of Labor. Washington, D.C. May 10, 1960.

Allied Masonry Council: Presentation of awards for devotion to the Education of the Youth of America and sound apprentice training. Washington, D.C. May 10, 1960.

Graduate School of Library Science of Drexel Institute of Technology: Presentation of Graduate Schools Distinguished Achievement Award for "humanitarian work on behalf of American Health Education and Welfare during 20 years of public service as a member of Congress and for his interpretation to the public, Congress and public agencies of the vital role of libraries in the preservation and dissemination of America's cultural heritage and in the advancement of Learning." Philadelphia, Pa. May 17, 1960.

Federal Hill Parent Teacher Association: Presentation of award with inscription "Champion of the People-Youth-Education-Medicine". Providence, R.I. June 19, 1960.

United Cerebral Palsy Association of R.I.: Certificate of Appreciation for unselfish and devoted service. Pawtucket, Rhode Island. June 22, 1960.

Muscular Dystrophy Association of America, Inc.: Special Citation for his devotion to those of our fellow citizens who suffer from crippling diseases. New York City. June 27, 1960.

President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped: Presentation specially prepared plate book of commemorative employ the handicapped postage stamp as a small token of appreciation of his help and support through the years. New York City. August 28, 1960.

R.I. Association for Retarded Children, Inc.: Dedication of Headquarters Building, to be known as "The John E. Fogarty Center". Providence, R.I. September 20, 1960.

R.I. League for Nursing: Citation for support of Nursing. Providence, R.I. October 20, 1960.

American Podiatry Association: Award of Man of the year. Hartford, Connecticut. October 22, 1960.

Association of Military Surgeons of the U.S.: Elected Honorary Member and awarded medal. Washington, D.C. November 1, 1960.

R.I. Library Association: Citation for championing the role of the library in the

American way of life. Providence, R.I. November 2, 1960.

Providence College: Citation and award of first Veritas Medal to be bestowed on those who have shown devoted and outstanding service to Providence College. Providence, R.I. November 14, 1960.

Alpha Omega Dental Fraternity: Achievement Medal for Extraordinary Public Service, Washington, D.C. December 29, 1960.

R.I. Heart Association: Presentation of silver bowl "In recognition of courage and service in the fight against heart disease." Providence, R.I. February 16, 1961.

American Association of Dental Schools: Honorary Membership in recognition of outstanding contributions to Dental Education and Research, Boston, Mass. March 27, 1961.

R. I. Education Association: Presentation of Charles Carroll Citizen Award for rendering outstanding service to R. I. Education. Providence, R.I. April 3, 1961.

Alpha Epsilon Delta International Premedical Honor Society: Honorary member as outstanding man in the country interested in both medical education and medical care of the aged. Providence College, Providence, R.I. April 16, 1961.

Lions Club: Testimonial of sincere appreciation of distinguished and unselfish service. Providence, R.I. May 20, 1961.

LaSalle Alumni Association: Distinguished Layman Award. Providence, R.I. May 29, 1961.

Fraternal Order of Eagles: Golden Eagle Award for leadership in the "Jobs after 40" Program, Providence, R.I. June 3, 1961.

Knights of Columbus: Outstanding Catholic Layman of R.I. Providence. June 3, 1961.

Brown University: Honorary Degree, Doctor of Laws. June 5, 1961.

Salve Regina College: Honorary Degree, Doctor of Laws. June 5, 1961.

Brandeis University: Honorary Degree, Doctor of Laws. June 11, 1961.

R.I. Optometric Association: Annual award of merit for contribution to visual welfare, Providence, R.I. June 10, 1961.

National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation: National Citation for Distinguished Service. Washington, D.C. June 15, 1961.

U.S. Department of Labor: Appointed as Representative to U.S. Labor Attaché Conference, Rome, Italy. July 2, 1961.

Kiwanis Club. Recognition of Contribution to Club, Providence. September 27, 1961.

American Cancer Society: Award for distinguished service. Providence. October 4, 1961.

American College of Dentists: Honorary Fellowship, Philadelphia, Pa. October 15, 1961.

National Association for Mental Health, Inc.: Award, Miami Beach, Florida. November 16, 1961.

R.I. Library Association: Honorary Membership. November 1, 1961.

Muscular Dystrophy Assn.: Award for success of 1961 Drive.

Butler Mental Health Center: Arthur Hiler Ruggles Award, Providence, R.I. March 5, 1962.

Delta Epsilon Sigma (Theta Chapter) National Catholic Scholastic Honor Society: Citation for distinguished service, Providence College, Providence, R.I. April 1962.

Dr. Joseph H. Ladd School: Dedication of the John E. Fogarty Medical and Rehabilitation Unit, North Kingstown, Rhode Island. April 29, 1962.

Government of D.C.: Certificate of Appreciation for invaluable contributions to welfare of his fellowmen. May 9, 1962.

Rhode Island Medical Society: Elected Honorary member. May 9, 1962.

Rhode Island State Association Future Farmers of America: Future Farmers of America Honorary State Farmer Degree. May 12, 1962.

Rhode Island Association Senior Citizens Club: Citation on Senior Citizens Day. May 20, 1962.

New York Medical College: Honorary Degree Doctor of Science. June 6, 1962.

R.I. Governors Committee on Employment of Handicapped: Citation for meritorious service for activity on behalf of handicapped. June 7, 1962.

Rhode Island College: Honorary degree Doctor of Pedagogy. June 9, 1962.

American Society of Medical Technologists and Canadian Society of Laboratory Technologists: Certificate of Appreciation for valuable contribution to Second North American Conference of Medical Laboratory Technologists. Washington, D.C. June 20, 1962.

St. Francis College: Honorary degree of Laws. October 6, 1962.

University of Rhode Island: Dedication of the John E. Fogarty Health Science Building for the Colleges of Pharmacy and Nursing. Kingston, R.I. October 10, 1962.

Northern Virginia Assn. for Retarded Children: Award for unusual efforts in fostering care and understanding for mentally handicapped children, Arlington, Va. October 16, 1962.

Portuguese Fayal Relief Committee: Award for assistance in introducing legislation to provide for victims of Fayal earthquake which permitted 2,000 families to come to U.S. Providence, R.I. October 21, 1962.

Association of Schools of Public Health: Award of Merit in gratitude for work done in interest of public health, education and welfare. Providence, R.I. November 3, 1962.

United Irish Council of R.I.: Award in recognition of outstanding achievements. Providence, R.I. December 2, 1962.

Alpha Zeta Fraternity (Agricultural and Professional Fraternity): Honorary membership, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I. December 5, 1962.

Rhode Island Heart Association: Honorary Member of Board, Providence, R.I. February 12, 1963.

Jewish War Veterans of USA: Award to outstanding Catholic for work in Brotherhood, Providence, R.I. February 22, 1963.

National Council Boy Scouts of America: Elected Honorary Member May, 1963.

World Health Organization: Appointed by President as Congressional Advisor to WHO Assembly in Geneva, Switzerland, May 7, 1963.

National Fraternal Society for the Deaf Prov. Div. No. 43: Certificate of appreciation in obtaining aid for advancement of the deaf, Providence, R.I. May 25, 1963.

Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania: Honorary Degree—Doctor of Laws. June 11, 1963.

International Congress on Education of the Deaf: Award of appreciation for efforts for deaf Washington, D.C. June 27, 1963.

International Association of Public Employment Services: Award of Merit, Chicago, Ill. July 2, 1963.

American Library Association: Annual Trustee Citation, Chicago, Ill. July 14, 1963.

American Association of Retired Persons, International: Citation for Distinguished Service, Copenhagen, Denmark. August 14, 1963.

R.I. Division of Vocational Rehabilitation: 1964 Ben Fish Award for outstanding contribution to the rehabilitation of disabled persons. Providence, R.I. October 18, 1963

Georgetown University: Honorary Degree—Doctor of Laws. October 28, 1963.

National Hemophilia Foundation: Humanitarian Award, Washington, D.C. December 6, 1963.

Italian Government: Decree from President of Italy conferring title "Commendatore al Merito della Repubblica Italiana." February 1, 1964.

National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation: Awards in recognition of dedicated service. Philadelphia, Pa. & Framingham, Mass. December 3, 1963 and January 25, 1964.

Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation: 1963 International Award in Field of Mental Retardation, NYC. February 5, 1964.

American Industrial Hygiene Association: Acclamation as foremost Champion of good health and particularly as an advocate of health protection of workers, Washington, D.C. February 6, 1964.

American Heart Association: Award of Merit, the first one to be bestowed by the National Association, Providence, R.I. February 9, 1964.

Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf: Resolution of expression of gratitude for efforts in behalf of deaf children. Riverside, Calif. April 17, 1964.

International Association of Machinists: Machinists non-partisan Political League All American Award, Westerly, R.I. April 18, 1964.

Massachusetts Dental Society: Honorary Membership, Boston, Mass. May 4, 1964.

New York University: New York University Medal in appreciation of meritorious service to his countrymen. Sterling Forest, N.Y. May 13, 1964.

Gallaudet College: Presentation of silver medallion on occasion of 100th Anniversary, Washington, D.C. June 6, 1964.

University of Notre Dame: Honorary Degree—Doctor of Laws. South Bend, Indiana. June 7, 1964.

Air Force Association: Citation of honor in tribute to dedicated and distinguished service in the field of educational research, Washington, D.C. September 9, 1964.

R.I. Recipients of Graduate Fellowships under PL 85–926: Expression of appreciation for opportunity to pursue studies in the education of retarded children. Providence, R.I. September 14, 1964.

Conference of State and Provincial Health Authorities of North America: Honorary Membership. October 3, 1964.

R.I. Conference of Social Work: 25th Anniversary Award, Providence, R.I. October 8, 1964.

Association of American Medical Colleges: Merit Award Medallion for signal service rendered American medical education. Denver, Colo. October 18, 1964.

The Myasthenia Gravis Foundation, Rhode Island Chapter: Honorary Membership Award for distinguished public service. Providence, R.I. November 18, 1964.

Pascoag Knights of Columbus: Plaque in expression of esteem for dedication to advancement and welfare of fellow man. Pascoag, R.I. January 30, 1965.

Fogarty Award Dinner: Award in recognition of years of dedicated work for the benefit of the mentally retarded. Providence, R.I. April 24, 1965.

R.I. College Alumni Association: Presentation John F. Kennedy Award. Providence, R.I. May 15, 1965.

World Health Organization: Appointed by President as Congressional Advisor to WHO Assembly in Geneva, Switzerland for sixth time. May 4–21, 1965.

Council for Exceptional Children: Citation for Legislative Statesmanship, Washington, D.C. June 1965.

Teachers College, Columbia University: Award Teachers College Medal for Distinguished Service, N.Y. June 1, 1965.

Providence Public Library: Elected Member of Corporation. Providence, R.I. June 4, 1965.

Manhattan College: Honorary Degree—Doctor of Laws, N.Y. June 8, 1965.

St. Joseph's Hospital: Citation in Appreciation, Providence, R.I. June 26, 1965.

Tri-Organizational Scientific and Clinical Conference: Dr. A. B. C. Knudson Rehabilitation Award, New York City. July 15, 1965.

International Association for Dental Researchers: Honorary Membership, Toronto, Canada. July 24, 1965.

American College of Osteopathic Intern-

ists: Honorary Fellowship, Philadelphia, Pa. September 30, 1965.

United States Jaycees: Member National Advisory Board for Mental Health and Mental Retardation Programs. September 1965.

National Association for Mental Health, Inc.: Honorary Membership, New York City. November 19, 1965.

National Society for Crippled Children and Adults: Award, Palmer House, Chicago, Ill. November 21, 1965.

Loyola University: Honorary Degree—Doctor of Laws, Chicago, Illinois. January 30, 1966.

American Heart Association, Inc.: Award Association's 1965 Heart of the Year Award, White House, Washington, D.C. February 3, 1966.

Washington University School of Dentistry: Citation for contribution to Advancement of Dental Science and Dental Education, St. Louis, Mo. March 18, 1966.

Institute for Retired Professionals of the New School for Social Research: Award for contribution to well-being of nation's older citizens, New York City. May 12, 1966.

World Health Organization: Appointed by President as Congressional Advisor to WHO Assembly in Geneva, Switzerland. May 3–5, May 20, 1966.

Connecticut State Dental Association: Fones Award for outstanding achievement in interest of humanity, Bridgeport, Conn. May 19, 1966.

Alpha Sigma Pi Fraternity of Gallaudet College: Man of the Year Award in Recognition of Outstanding Contributions to Welfare of the Deaf, Washington, D.C. May 25, 1966.

R.I. Parents Council for Hearing and Handicapped Children, Inc.: Appreciation Award, Providence, R.I. May 26, 1966.

College of Osteopathic Medicine and Surgery: Honorary Degree—Doctor of Science, Des Moines, Iowa. June 2, 1966.

National Council of Senior Citizens: Award of merit for outstanding work on behalf of elderly citizens, Washington, D.C. June 3, 1966.

Howard University: Honorary Degree—Doctor of Laws, Washington, D.C. June 3, 1966.

Gallaudet College: Honorary Degree—Doctor of Laws, Washington, D.C. June 13, 1966.

University of the Pacific: Honorary Degree—Doctor of Science, San Francisco, Cal. June 15, 1966.

American Library Association: Lifetime Honorary Membership, New York City. July 10, 1966.

BIOGRAPHY FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

John Edward Fogarty, Democrat, of Harmony, R.I., elected in 1940; reelected to succeeding Congresses.

PREFACE

More perhaps than anything else, the career of John E. Fogarty symbolizes the strength and magnificent vitality of American democracy. Through all his labors in a quarter century of public service, there runs a common thread: Jeffersonian faith in the capacity of ordinary men to govern themselves, and to do a better job in the long run than a ruling elite.

John Fogarty's approach to public service was based upon a simple belief in democratic processes as a means for improving man's lot and enriching his life. He knew well that a stunted mind or deformed body represented formidable obstacles to that goal. He also knew that man's capacity to attack disease and poverty and ignorance had been enormously strengthened by modern science and technology. This knowledge, and the determination to use it productively, constituted his special strength as a Congressional leader.

Characteristically, his deepest concern was of the young. Here, the inroads of disease and deprivation are the deepest, and the need for marshaling all resources of help the most pressing. For his efforts to aid handicapped children—particularly the mentally retarded—and to enlist the Nation's conscience in their behalf, John Fogarty will be remembered with gratitude. The work that he started will stand as a monument to his vision and insight and restless energy. It is the only kind of monument that would have meant much to him—the knowledge that he had brought help to those society has long ignored or overlooked.

The impact of this man on the cause closest to him—the support of medical research—is impossible to exaggerate. If the National Institutes of Health is today the world's most powerful and influential force for the support and conduct of medical research, it is in large part because John Fogarty early perceived its promise and fought tenaciously for its programs. Thus his influence touches not only the lives of Americans but all who are beneficiaries of medical advance throughout the world.

Truly John Fogarty achieved a stature of international recognition. His service as United States Delegate to the annual assemblies of the World Health Organization extended his associations and influence to world wide dimensions. As a consequence he gained a profound understanding of the crucial role of health in the development of nations and as a common cause around which the peace of the world could be sought. His espousal of "Health for Peace" legislation and for a broader international role for the United States in health and science derived from this deep conviction. The proposal of Representative Melvin Laird to enlist congressional support in the establishment of "The John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences" at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Maryland, would be the finest commemoration of this man's work for the well being of his fellow man.

In Congress he left behind a legacy of service in behalf of better health which few have approached and none surpassed. This is reflected in the tributes appearing in this volume—spontaneous expressions from friends and associates in all walks of life.

The spirit in which John Fogarty labored and the devotion he brought to his task are mirrored in the simple words of Washington's Farewell Address: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The rest is in the hands of God."

In concluding, might I once again reaffirm my condolences, my sympathies to the family, and congratulate them on the fact that JOHN's passing has been recognized by the world, by the State of Rhode Island, by the Congress, but especially by the millions of men, women, and children from all walks of life for whom he did so much.

CONTROL OF "NOISE POLLUTION"

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, I am today reintroducing legislation to retard the rapid advance of "noise pollution" and to provide remedial steps necessary for general noise control.

On April 21, 1966, I introduced in the second session of the 89th Congress, H.R. 14602, to establish an Office of Noise Control within the Office of the Surgeon General. The Office, headed by a Director and assisted by a noise control Advisory Council, would provide grants to States and local governments to research ways and means of control, prevention and abatement of noise. This bill does not provide the Office of Noise Control within the Office of the Surgeon General with any regulatory powers, nor does it suggest a national regulatory code.

The Office of Noise Control, under my bill, would cooperate fully with existing Federal agencies and others presently working in the specific field of jet noise abatement, and would conduct research and prepare, publish and disseminate educational material dealing with the control, prevention, and abatement of noise from aircraft and other sources as well.

The primary function of the Office of Noise Control would be to act as a national clearinghouse for general and specific noise information, and could, upon request, disseminate the wealth of its accumulated knowledge to the States and local governments to help them control noise at its point of origin.

The Office of Noise Control would serve a similar function with respect to noise from all sources as the National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, a nonprofit, private-industry-supported noise research center—originated April 1960—presently serves in the field of aircraft noise abatement.

Mr. Speaker, a considerable degree of attention has been focused on the problems of aircraft noise abatement within the past year, culminating in the International Conference of the Reduction of Noise and Disturbances Caused by Civil Aircraft, held at the Lancaster House, London, England, November 22 to 30, 1966.

The plans for the November 1966 conference originated when Mr. Roy Jenkins, the United Kingdom Minister of Aviation, invited the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arrange for U.S. participation in the international conference. Delegates from 26 nations, 11 international organizations, as well as airport authorities, aircraft and engine manufacturers, airline operators and scientists or other scholars, prepared technical papers and met and exchanged views on the broad subject of aircraft noise abatement.

I am informed by Raymon Shepanek, chairman of the U.S. delegation, that there was no formal U.S. position on items to be considered by the conference because of the wide variety of U.S. interests affected, and the fact that the U.S. interagency noise abatement program would not have formulated definite alleviation programs prior to the convening of the conference.

Sensitivity to the potential noise from the proposed supersonic transport has engendered new interest in noise control. Hand in hand with a review of the noise effects of the SST goes a consideration of the phenomena of sonic boom.

Sonic boom has been described by Leo L. Beranek, chairman of the acoustical standards board of Bolt, Beranek & Newman, and author of a recent article in Scientific American entitled "Noise," which appears at the end of this statement, as follows:

When an airplane moves faster than the speed of sound, it produces shock waves that

trail in the wake of the plane like the disturbances in the water wake of a rapidly moving boat. The shock waves generate a pressure wave that constitutes the sonic boom. On the ground a typical sonic boom from a high-flying airplane represents a series of rapid changes in air pressure lasting half a second: the pressure suddenly rises by as much as two pounds per square foot, then drops below atmospheric pressure by about the same amount and finally jumps back to normal pressure. The noise of the boom usually consists of two closely spaced, explosive reports.

The sonic-boom "wake" behind the airplane, fanning out in the shape of a cone, spans an area on the earth below that depends on the height at which the plane is flying. Typically the path of the boom on the ground is about 33 miles wide when the plane is at an altitude of three and a half miles and 50 miles wide when it is flying at a height of nine miles. The higher the plane flies, the weaker is the intensity of the boom at the ground.

Now that it is clear that Boeing Co. will be involved in the airframe design and General Electric Co. with the engine of the SST, I am most interested in the role that noise control will play in the present and future research and planning of the SST. I am pleased to see that research will continue before actual construction, and hopeful that among the items to be studied will be a way to prevent the effects of sonic boom.

For an evaluation of the effects of sonic boom on our society, I have included at the end of this statement a summary of an address by Bo Lundberg, director general of the Aeronautical Research Institute of Sweden, entitled "The Menace of the Sonic Boom to Society and Civil Aviation," presented at the Fourth International Congress for Noise Abatement held in Baden Baden, Germany, May 1966.

Incidentally, Robert Alex Baron, a constituent of mine and an ardent proponent for noise control, also attended the fourth international congress. A copy of his address appears in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1966, pages A2629 and A2630.

In my original statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 7, pages 8745 through 8768, I set forth a detailed discussion of noise. In addition, I have included supporting papers and articles of interest to the student of noise, as well as a representation of the worldwide written response I have received on this subject. My additional statements and supporting papers and materials appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 7, pages 9470 to 9477; volume 112, part 8, page 9679; the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1966, pages A2629 and A2630; the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 9, pages 12191 to 12205; the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 1, 1966, pages A4048 and 4049; the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 14, pages 18233 to 18257, volume 112, part 15, page 20388; volume 112, part 20, pages 27803 to 27824; and volume 112, part 20, page 27874.

Favorable comment by the senior Senator from the State of Washington, Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, on my various statements appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 17, 1967 at page 614, in connection with his discussion of the subject of the Electric Vehicle Development Act and its contribution to the fight on air and noise pollution.

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held a 1-day hearing on October 12, 1966, to consider bills dealing specifically with jet aircraft noise control, including my legislation, H.R. 17252. A copy of my statement to the subcommittee appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 20, page 27803. I am today also reintroducing H.R. 17252, my aircraft noise control bill.

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics hearing last October was a very small step toward a program for the solution of the overall problem of noise reduction and control.

If there is one lesson that we should have learned from the current crisis of air pollution it is that if proper educational and remedial steps in that area had been taken 10 years ago the problem of air pollution might not have reached the critical proportions it has today. We are now at the same relative point with respect to the environmental problem of noise pollution. We must act sensibly and take precautionary steps now so that in the future we will not be faced with a costly dilemma that will cause us an undeterminable amount of bodily harm. I strongly urge the Congress to face its responsibility now with respect to adequate noise control.

There follows an up-to-date accumulations of pertinent articles, including those referred to in my statement above, as well as supporting papers, editorials, and general response to the problem of noise abatement:

[From Engineer Magazine, Autumn 1966]

NOISE: THE NEED FOR LEGISLATION AND TECHNOLOGY

(By Congressman THEODORE R. KUPERMAN)

The idea that noise is a necessary price of industrial and economic progress is as antiquated as is the belief that contaminated waters and a polluted atmosphere must also accompany civilization's material advances. Noise pollution, however, unlike water and air pollution, is only now beginning to receive a proper share of public attention.

Noise, more so than others, however, is a local problem. Its abatement requires a complex blend of technical application and legislative control. Engineers are frequently in a position to help combat this growing nuisance because of their key role in equipment and facilities design, operation, and construction, and initiative to alleviate noise problems by those who can do so, may, in fact, head off the inevitable public clamor for enforced control, as has happened with air and water pollution.

A mounting awareness of some of the consequences of a noisy environment has focused new attention on the problem. Loss of hearing, nervous disorders, irritability and inefficiency, and even hypertension and coronary conditions have been attributed to noise by a large body of medical opinion.

LOSS OF HEARING NOT INEVITABLE

We need not, however, accept loss of hearing—a widespread by-product of old age in the United States—as an inevitable condition of advancing years. This was shown in three separate studies of the Mabaan Tribe who dwell in a "noiseless" environment in the southeast Sudan. The members of this tribe suffered no loss of hearing with increasing age.

As a possible explanation for this loss of hearing, we may turn to Dr. Thomas H. Fay, Jr., chief of the Communicative Disorder Service at New York University Medical College, who points out that damage to tiny nerve endings in the inner ear may occur gradually over a long period of time as a result of continuous exposure to noise.

Psychological effects are another consequence of noise. According to Dr. Julius Buchwald, a psychiatrist at the New York State Medical Center, when noise interrupts a person's sleep, he is prevented from dreaming, which may result in such symptoms as paranoiac delusions and hallucinal and suicidal impulses. Another psychiatrist subscribes to the theory of "dream privation" as a factor in psychosis.

Before we go on to define noise and to describe its sources, we might also mention that in addition to physical and psychological damage, noise detracts from the quality of our lives much like a filthy street or a polluted stream. In the long run, this reason for attenuating noise will reflect how civilized we have a right to call ourselves.

NOISE DEFINED—SUBJECTIVELY, OBJECTIVELY

What is noise? Simply defined, it is unwarranted sound. Subjectively, noise is something we hear and recognize, such as a train whistle. Objectively, it is an energy wave transmitted to the air by vibrating air molecules. Most commonly, noise level is measured in decibels. Abbreviated "db", the decibel is a dimensionless unit that describes levels of acoustic pressure, power, and intensity. It is a logarithmic ratio between two sound pressures. Octave bands, which are arbitrary spreads of frequencies, are useful for rating noise hazards since some frequencies tend to cause hearing damage more than others.

Industrial noise levels generally range from 5 db to 125 db, sometimes even higher. Everyday conversation is about 6 db. Small communities on the outskirts of urban areas may have a rumble of 30 db by day, and 25 by night. In determining the effects of noise on human beings, three factors must be considered:

Intensity of sound
Length of exposure
The individual's tolerance level

People, however, do react in some universal ways to noise. About 130 db is the maximum noise bearable to human ears. This level approximates the sound of a jet at an airport. Chronic exposure to less noise, however, may well result in loss of hearing. It is believed that the danger level for persistent noise is 85 db after which severe damage to hearing ensues. The noise level in cities has risen an estimated 1 db a year for the last 30 years.

Though the airplane has been singled out as the leading noise maker and the fight against noise focuses on winged craft, there are other sources of noise pollution, among them traffic noise, construction noise, household noise, and industrial noise.

Excessive traffic noise is largely caused by trucks. A defective muffler in a truck generates the noise equivalent of 90 to 100 cars. According to acoustical expert Lewis S. Goodfriend, a fellow of the Acoustical Society of America, many cities with populations over 100,000 have laws requiring mufflers. Practically all states have laws specifying that mufflers must be used to prevent "excessive, unusual and/or unnecessary noise." To prove whether or not a given truck is too noisy, some cities like Milwaukee use noise meters and set maximum sound levels as measured at a given distance from the vehicle. Enforcement of such regulations, nevertheless, remains a problem.

In July 1965, New York State passed legislation which defines excessive noise as a db

level of 88 or greater at 50 feet from a vehicle. The legislation prohibits noise beyond this level on its public highways. The noise is measured at roadside toll stations where trucks pass at speeds less than 35 miles per hour. Truck manufacturers helped to set the 88 maximum db level by testifying at the hearings on the bill that new mufflers keep truck noise at a level near 80 db or below. However, the more the muffler is used, the less efficient it becomes, the truck manufacturers said.

Particularly irritating to urbanites is the noise generated by air compressors, pneumatic drills, power saws, cement mixers, and other machines involved in the demolition and construction of buildings. In New York City, such noise is permitted only between the hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m., six days a week (and at night by special permit).

Construction companies can, however, minimize the noise from their building activities, as the Diesel Construction Co. did effectively in constructing a 52-story office building in lower Manhattan. A number of noise muffling techniques were used: Foundation blasting was muffled with special steel wire mesh blankets; joints were welded rather than riveted or bolted; demolition was carried out mostly during late hours and weekends when offices in the district were deserted.

In addition, although not widely used, muffling devices are available for construction equipment. For $200, a simple device called a "residential quality silencer," for example, can be attached to an air compressor unit.

Even in the "luxury" apartment, there is little protection against noise. Modern buildings, constructed with lightweight materials, offer less soundproofing than do older buildings. To combat this so-called "inside noise," the President's Panel on Environmental Pollution urges that local regulations establish performance standards that will prevent noises from easily penetrating apartments through thin walls and air ducts.

ACOUSTICAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

The Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn is doing just this for New York City and is developing acoustical performance standards for inclusion in the city's building code. As a further help, the National Bureau of Standards has made available a monograph based on test results of over 100 buildings. It is entitled "Sound Insulation of Wall, Floor & Door Constructions" (#77-1964).

Noise abatement is probably most immediately on the minds of those whose homes are within a 5-mile radius of a jet airport. Not too long ago, Newark Airport was closed as a result of complaints by a fearful and hostile community. In Manhattan's high rent area of Sutton and Beekman Place, residents are up in arms about the heliport which has been located on top of the Pan American building. Seattle residents recently concluded a successful lawsuit against the nearby airport by arguing that the airport authority was using their property in overflying it. This has raised fears that similar damage suits will be initiated elsewhere.

Many government agencies are concerned about the increasing clamor over jet noise. The armed forces, in cooperation with the National Research Council, has established a Committee on Hearing and Bio-acoustics which is to advise the military on noise problems. NASA, too, has become an important pioneer in noise research. The agency realizes that unless the public can be shielded from excessive noise it is pointless to continue research on advanced aircraft.

Under increased pressure, aircraft manufacturers are designing for increased noise suppression in the aircraft itself. The 490-passenger Boeing 747, for example, is being designed to produce less noise than the 707, even though the newer model's engines will develop 40,000 pounds of thrust as compared to the 707's 15,000 pounds. Work also continues apace on the more difficult problem of suppressing noise in existing planes.

SONIC BOOM—THREAT TO BE FACED

Another instrument for our nation's attack on airplane noise is legislative action, which to date has hardly been employed at all. Perhaps the most striking illustration of its use is in effect at Dulles Airport in Washington, D.C. There a zoning law has established a buffer area of rural vacant land.

Sonic boom, however, which will accompany the advent of supersonic transports, poses a threat of entirely different dimensions. These shock waves stretch out as much as 80 miles, and no longer affect only residents located near the airport. In 1964, a study of the effects of sonic boom on people revealed that 25 per cent could not accept the thunderous sound. It is my understanding that sonic boom inevitably accompanies supersonic transports and cannot be adequately designed away. How this fact will be reconciled with the supersonic project has not yet been made clear.

Other noises come from both the electrical appliances that serve the housewife everyday and from industry whose manufacturing noises disrupt residential neighborhoods. To combat noise from vacuum cleaners, dishwashers, and other electrical appliances, the consumer himself should include "quietness" as a criterion for purchasing these items. Sufficient demand for quiet performance will spur manufacturers to produce less noisy equipment or to provide muffling devices where noise reduction cannot be further designed into a product. To prevent industrial noises interfering with the serenity of residential living, noise experts have suggested that modern zoning ordinances include measured decibel limits at property lines as legal protection against noise-producing industries. Here again, we have an illustration of the potential power of legislative enactment, particularly zoning requirements.

BILL TO ASSIST STATE, LOCAL GOVERNMENT

I have been concerned about noise ever since I served on the City Council of New York where one of my last actions was to introduce a bill to ban the playing of transistor radios in public without the use of an earplug. As a congressman, I am even more interested in noise abatement because it continues to intrude on the quality of living and deserves increased attention across the nation. My own congressional district, for example, must now contend with the noises generated by the whirly-birds that buzz atop the Pan American building.

On April 21, 1966, I introduced a bill (H.R. 14602) which provides for a variety of activities to cope with noise. The bill does not suggest a national regulatory code. It provides instead for federal funds to assist state and local governments to initiate their own program of noise control and to finance an educational campaign to foster awareness of the advantages of a more quiet environment. The bill includes proposals to centralize aircraft noise research projects under NASA and to authorize the Federal Aviation Agency to reimburse municipalities and airline and airport owners and operators for part of the cost of land acquisition and for technical modifications made to reduce jet noise. My bill also provides for establishing an office of noise control which would collect from other federal agencies data relating to noise control.

For the first year it is in effect the bill requests $3 million to finance matching grants to the states and another $5 million for federal financing of research and demonstration projects. Both these amounts are to be increased over a five-year period with an incremental rise each year. In essence, these sums will supplement the more than $60 million a year that is spent on sound-deadening materials for buildings and the nearly $175 million that the aviation industry and government have invested in anti-noise research and equipment.

I welcome constructive suggestions from engineers with fresh insight and new knowledge to share.

[From McGraw-Hill's Air and Water News, Dec. 5, 1966]

MORE NOISE ABOUT NOISE: FEDERAL ACTION EXPECTED NEXT YEAR

An airport decides to build a new jet wing near a residential district and hostile citizens scream, "no."

A man in Philadelphia tries to take a blaring transistor radio away from a woman sitting next to him on a bus. In the tussle, it strikes her on the head. He is indicted by a grand jury.

Two doctors from the Harvard School of Public Health say excessive noise can cause hearing loss.

The Federal Government is expected to give major attention to "Noise Pollution" during the upcoming legislative session.

Attacks against noise in the environment are almost as old as civilization itself, but it's only been in recent years—with the upsurge in industry, motor and air traffic, and population—that it has reached national concern.

During the last Congress, Rep. Theodore R. Kupferman (R-N.Y.) introduced a bill which would provide for an investigation of the noise problem and would establish an Office of Noise Control within the Office of the Surgeon General. Since then, the Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare has appointed a Task Force on Environmental Health which has been charged among other things with investigating noise as a threat to health. Rep. Kupferman also has stepped up his "noise" campaign and plans to reintroduce his bill in the upcoming session "with even stronger ramifications."

"Unlike water and air pollution," he says, "the threat of excess and uncontrolled noise is not widely recognized as a serious and immediate problem. For example, there is evidence that excessive noise destroys efficiency, interrupts minimum requirements of sleep, can cause deafness, strains the nervous systems, is extremely costly, causes accidents, and interfers with school programs."

He cited a New York City situation where a contractor is now free to operate machinery at harmful noise levels any time between the hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. "Anyone who has been awakened at 7 in the morning to the deafening tune of an air compressor or pneumatic drill outside his window knows the frustration, if not neuroses, which construction noise may cause."

He also stressed the effect that constant noise can have upon a person's hearing. He said it is generally agreed that 130 decibels is the maximum noise bearable for human ears and that this level would approximate the sound of jets in this airport. But he added that prolonged exposure to less—say 110 decibles—may well result in loss of hearing.

Two Harvard University doctors support him. Doctors John Dougherty and Oliver Welsh of the Guggenheim Center for Aerospace Health and Safety of the Harvard School of Public Health published an article on "Community Noise and Hearing Loss" in the Oct. 6 issue of the New England Journal of Medicine. They concluded that available evidence supports the association of hearing loss with noise and possibly with arteriosclerotic vascular disease.

Included in Rep. Kupferman's expected legislative proposals would be requests for Federal grants to the states and local governments for research, prevention and abatement of noise.

Elsewhere in the country, some local communities have taken the problem into their own hands. Philadelphia's Noise Abatement Committee was responsible for an anti-noise

law which banned noise in five general areas: In handling trash and garbage cans, in construction work, by street vendors, by vehicles and in the vicinity of hospitals and churches. Violations carry a fine of $10 for the first offense, $25 for the second offense and $50 for subsequent offenses, together with imprisonment not exceeding 30 days if the fine and costs are not paid within 10 days. The city has won seven consecutive awards from the National Noise Abatement Committee of the National Fire—Safety Conference.

In Chicago, a new school near O'Hare Airport is being built windowless and soundproof to keep out the noise of planes from the air field. In Seattle, Wash., residents recently concluded a successful damage suit against the nearby airport by arguing that the airport authority was using their property in overflying it.

Other countries have also taken significant strides in this area: Western Germany has a law against construction noise, and Paris has banned all hornblowing.

All of this was done quietly, of course.

[From McCall's magazine, January 1967]

NOISE—HOW MUCH MORE CAN WE TAKE?

The din at home, at work, in the skies and in the streets is spoiling our dispositions, fraying our nerves and literally deafening millions of us. It will get worse—unless we do something about it—by Sam Blum. About eight in the evening, not long ago, in New York's Chelsea area, a housewife marched out of her apartment house and in a cold fury informed a gang ripping up the street that they were keeping her child awake. Said the foreman: "Thanks, lady. I was afraid we were going to be here all night. Our orders were to keep working until someone complained."

In the quiet that instantly followed, our heroine was stricken with a sense of cause. "Is it possible," she asked herself, "that we are all needlessly suffering noise in silence? If a ninety-three-pound woman can single-handedly silence six men built like pile drivers, what might a whole neighborhood of aroused femininity accomplish?" In just such a fashion do all revolutions snowball, with small successes leading to big dreams; and from the many small successes we have recently heard of, we feel we can say with certainty that the antinoise revolution has already been well launched.

In fact, we believe that the classic definition of noise as "unwarranted sound" is today being amended. It was always a bad definition, anyway, for it led to the unanswerable question "Unwanted by whom?" But now, for all practical purposes, noise might well be defined as "sound so intensely unwanted that it leads citizens to complain, organize, sue, vote, boycott and generally raise Cain."

We have happily reached a point where growing numbers of people seem prepared to do all these things. To take a fast world survey, we find people insisting that noise has soured their wine, devalued their property, toppled their castle walls, deprived them of dreams, induced their coronaries, denuded their chickens, driven their minks berserk, broken their windows, made them nervous wrecks, denied them sleep, literally deafened them. A good number of these excited citizens have asked compensation for their difficulties in cash—and they have been finding juries sympathetic.

Hurray for them! There is no question that the vast bulk of the cacophony that surrounds us is completely unnecessary and could be eliminated if more of us who seek quiet were not so afraid of making a fuss.

That, at least, was the conclusion of most of the acoustical experts, designers, architects, city planners and people who just hate noise with whom we recently talked. At the request of McCall's, we were attempting to discover (1) what noise really does to people and (2) how people can defend themselves from its more pernicious effects. And it turned out that answers to the first question are a bit debatable, but to the second they are hard and fast. The best defense against noise is a hearty attack on it.

What Can Noise Do To You? Over a hundred years ago, physicians knew that blacksmiths, boilermakers and others who work in the midst of constant clanging sounds often grow hard of hearing. No one doubted that noise was causing the deafness; but also no one became very involved in solving the problem until, in 1948, a worker sued and won compensation for a hearing loss caused by on-the-job noise. When other claims were immediately filed, it became horrifyingly clear to American industry that it was about to face some extraordinary expenses.

The first hurried surveys indicated that almost half of all machines used in manufacturing produced noises that could contribute to hearing loss. It became necessary for management to know just what levels of noise were harmful and how workers could be protected. Thus the first serious American attack on noise began.

Sound is generally measured in decibles, and it is currently believed that daily exposure to continuous noise louder than 90 decibles (on a sound meter's A scale) will in time probably produce some hearing loss. The louder the noise is over 90, the faster it will do damage and the worse the damage will be. But you don't need a sound meter to recognize dangerous noise.

According to Dr. Aram Glorig, of the Callier Hearing and Speech Center in Dallas, Texas, "A rough and dirty method of assessing whether a noise is dangerous is if it is so loud that it washes out voices and you have to shout about a foot away from someone's ear to make him hear you. If so, and you work in it all day long for a period of years, it can produce a hearing loss." You can also tell that a noise is dangerously loud if, on coming out of several hours in it, you have a ringing in the ears or a temporary slight loss of hearing that muffles speech.

Since most noise-produced hearing problems start with the loss of sounds above the range of speech, people generally do not even become aware of progressive deafness until a few years have passed and it suddenly dawns on them that everyone seems to be mumbling.

After about ten years of working in a dangerously loud noise, it will have done its worst. The hearing loss, which might be mild or serious, will be permanent, and there is no known medical treatment for it. At that point, however, says Dr. Glorig, "you might just as well stick with your noisy job. Unless the noise gets louder, it will do no further harm." Your hearing, though, will continue to deteriorate, as almost everyone's does, as you grow older.

Some scientists, however, have grown to suspect that even the so-called normal loss that comes with age might also be caused by noise. Studies of an African tribe, the Mabaans, by New York ear surgeon Samuel Rosen, would seem to support this idea. The Mabaans, Dr. Rosen discovered, have hearing as acute at age 75 as the average American has at 25. One of the most reasonable explanations for this is that they live remarkably quiet lives in a remarkably quiet area. Birdcalls are said to be among the loudest sounds they hear on an average day.

From Dr. Rosen's study, one could argue that countless sounds to which most of us are exposed are louder than are good for us. But the final word on the ability of everyday noise to produce hearing loss is far from in. Furthermore, even if living quieter lives when young does improve our hearing in old age, most of us would not care to give up the pleasures that many loud sounds add to our lives.

Recently, this writer, accompanied by Richard M. Guernsey, senior engineer with Goodfriend-Ostergaard Associates, Acoustical Engineers, set out with a sound-level meter to investigate some of the noisiest spots in Manhattan. We tried the obvious places first. A pneumatic hammer from a distance of about 15 feet produced an A-scale reading of 96. A subway train screeching to a stop sent the needle to 98, and the noisiest area in the press room of a daily newspaper showed a din of 102. All these sound levels are unpleasant—even inhuman—but the loudest spot we found was Sybil Christopher's discothèque Arthur, where the miracle of electronics enabled the performers to create a sound level as astonishingly elevated as the dancers' hemlines. It seldom fell below 103 and had peaks at 105. An unforgettable experience! But as a young lady at the next table yelled in our ear, "If Jackie Kennedy can take it, so can I!"

Mr. Guernsey's statistics indicated that boo-ga-looing for only 45 minutes a day, five days a week for ten years, to such volume would be hazardous. But he also doubted that many patrons would be able to keep up the pace sufficiently to injure themselves. Since the average age in our corner of the room appeared to be about 17, we concluded that by voting age, most humans must turn to quieter, perhaps more serious pastimes (Poulenc's "Concerto for Organ, String Orchestra, and Timpani," as recently heard from the twentieth row in Lincoln Center's Philharmonic Hall for example, had no peaks over a safe and sane 84 decibels, and at least four or five in the audience were known to this writer as reformed twisters.) However, that leaves the Arthur waiters to worry about and, even more so, the musicians.

"A large percentage of musicians have hearing losses," says Dr. Glorig. "Rachmaninoff had a very severe hearing loss. So did Fritz Kreisler. We measured the Marine Band and found that at least half of them have moderate to sever losses." And yet we must face the fact that art has always demanded a certain amount of sacrifice.

So has sport. For example, when Dr. Glorig recently surveyed 900 dentists and discovered, to his surprise, that many of them had a problem with high-frequency sounds, he turned to studying their hobbies and discovered that all the afflicted were skeet shooters.

Gunfire, like hammering or riveting, is extremely dangerous to hearing. Some people have experienced severe hearing losses after only one gunshot, and therefore hearing experts strongly advise riflemen to buy a good pair of professionally fitted earplugs. (Cotton in the ears, one of the oldest of antinoise safety devices, is still in wide use, though it is of no value at all.)

To risk noise-produced hearing loss is generally unnecessary. Most people can be protected from dangerous noises even on the job. Once a noise is known to be above the danger point, one has several obvious choices.

1. By far the best solution is to reduce the noise at its source by using quieter or better muffled machinery.

2. Where the machinery can't be muffled, it can often be isolated. Either the machine or the worker can be in a soundproof enclosure.

3. When men and noise must absolutely coexist, the man can still be protected with earplugs or earmuffs of the type worn by airport ground crews.

4. And failing all else, one can just do one's best to stay away from noise where it is loudest and get a rest from it as often as possible. Dr. John D. Dougherty, of the Harvard School of Public Health, believes that the noise to which most of us are exposed is so significant a threat to our hearing that not only factory workers but the average person, too, should make a real effort to cut down the amount of time he spends each day in a noisy environment, whether that environment be a kitchen whose appliances were chosen without regard to their noisiness or

the seat of a power lawn mower, where the decibel count may exceed that of a factory in full swing.

What noise might be doing to you. Noises that truly infuriate are generally far below the level that damage hearing. The neighbor's radio, the roar of traffic, the footsteps overhead, the postal machine in the next office all leave your eardrums intact, but do play nasty tricks on your ulcer. The World Health Organization refers to such noises as "urban pollution" and states flatly that they "substantially contribute to nervous disease, insomina, ill temper and accidents."

These noises are affecting the emotional level of our society in a number of ways. Dr. Sylvan S. Tomkins, of Princeton, New Jersey, an expert in the study of emotional responses, claims, for example, that "since a high level of noise arouses in us either distress or anger—you can see the distress response in children; make a loud enough noise, and they begin to cry—we're paying a very high price for the noise that surrounds us in that we are all much more ready to cry or become angry than we need to be."

Many physicians, such as Dr. Lee E. Farr, of the University of Texas, believes that even very low levels of everyday noise can be physically and emotionally harmful. Says Dr. Farr: "I really don't think that the intensity of the sound has any relation to the degree of the reaction. It all depends on the individual and his relationship to it. Most people like the noise they themselves make; its' the other fellow who suffers. And I like to use the example of patients with tetanus. Here we have an extreme hypersensitivity. A very minor sound, like snapping your fingers will set these people off into serious convulsions."

Although no one particular noise might be enough to cause severe distress, Dr. Farr believes that "every noise that tends to anger or frustrate reinforces other irritations that lead to gastronintestinal disorders, migraine attacks and many other psychosomatic problems."

The question, then, from the standpoint of mental health, is not how loud the noise is but how frustrating. A few years ago, Dr. Karl D. Kryter, of the Stanford Research Institute, worked out a list of qualities that make noises particularly annoying:

1. Unexpectedness (the jet boom that startles you just as you're falling asleep).

2. Interference (the static on the phone that drowns out every fourth or fifth word of the long-distance call).

3. Intermittency (the machine that turns on and off with no fixed patterns you can grow used to).

4. Reverberation (that damned rumble you can't identify or locate).

5. Inappropriateness (the lady eating popcorn next to you in the movies).

And we would add to the list:

6. Unattractiveness (of the image brought to mind. The sound of waves or a waterfall near your summer home might lull you to sleep; but the no louder sounds of the new highway will keep you awake and vowing vengeance).

Obviously, the question of appropriateness or unattractiveness depends on the individual. Teen-agers wander about with transistor radios blaring in their coat pockets. They do not hear The Mamas and The Papas as noise, but as the very beat of life never out of place. But they are making our beaches and our buses extremely disagreeable places for those of us attempting to keep pace to a different drummer. When out of key with our own thoughts and emotions, music is the most intrusive and infuriating of noises.

A number of antinoise curmudgeons have even suggested that it be made illegal to play a radio in public without using earphones—Congressman Theodore Kupferman, of New York, once backed such legislation—but so far nothing has come of it. Nevertheless, someday, when an afternoon at the beach has grown just a bit less distinguishable from an evening at the discothéque, it is to be hoped that a national committee for silent sunning will demand the passage of such a bill. And while they are at it, they might work at banning music in a host of other public places. Can one justify the airlines' bragging of the quietness of their cabins (Whisperjets, no less), then piping in Tijuana Brass? And even more to the point, can one explain why the elevator to Congressman Kupferman's law office should relentlessly be grinding out old Jerome Kern favorites?

These infuriating intrusions on our desire to sulk in silence can be fought successfully. Recently, for example, the editor of *The New Yorker* threatened to move the magazine's entire operation into another building if the management did not turn off the music in the elevators; and a proper silence again reigns at *The New Yorker*.

It is the misfortune of the antinoise forces that although great numbers of physicians believe it, no solid research was ever *proved* that noise has an effect on mental or nervous illness. If the harmful effects of everyday noise could once and for all be certified, it is possible that the federal government would respond with one of its famous wars. Like crime, poverty, cancer and the Viet Cong, noise could be declared a threat to the Great Society, and an attempt could be made to wipe it out, Texas Ranger style.

But there is not much hope of seeing such a campaign for some time to come. Last April, Congressman Kupferman, inspired by an infuriated constituent who works at night, yet is unable to sleep in the daytime because of construction work going on under his window, introduced a bill in Congress to set up an Office of Noise Control within the office of the Surgeon General. On being asked what chances he thought this bill had of passing, Mr. Kupferman answered, "None. Congress remains deaf to the problem."

Congressman Kupferman, taking on faith the likelihood that unwanted sound does harm—if not to the ears, or heart, or mind, at least to the soul—vows to go on with the fight and might well be providing a starting point from which we could retune our society.

NOISE ON THE STREETS, "The things that make noise—trucks, railroad engines, diesels, compressors—all these things can be quieted," says acoustical consultant Lewis Goodfriend. But the "can be," he points out, is theoretical in some cases. For example, mufflers exist that could be used to quiet pneumatic hammers; but they are cumbersome and expensive. Were there a real demand for less noisy hammers, the mufflers would surely be improved, or new, quieter ways of breaking up pavements would make the hammers obsolete. (A flame-throwing device showed promise a few years ago, until cooler heads asked what would happen if it accidentally sliced into a gas line.) But for the moment quiet hammers are impractical.

Even now, however, there are relatively inexpensive mufflers that could quiet the compressors that run the hammers. And these could be installed immediately. But in talking with almost any builder or street contractor, one concludes that they won't be installed. Builders and contractors are remarkably vague concerning the muffling art. In general, they are sure of only one thing: Mufflers cost money and add no value to the finished product.

Therefore, Mr. Goodfriend is undoubtedly right in feeling that "they will never be put into use until workmen's compensation cases make not muffling machinery uneconomical or legislation demands that mufflers be used."

Other forms of sound control have proved easier to legislate and are highly effective. Zoning that carefully separates residential areas from those that permit manufacturing and zoning that excludes trucks from residential streets are obvious examples. Where laws are precise, they can work. New York City, for example, a few years ago passed a simple law that strictly forbade blowing an automobile horn except in an emergency. And though horns continue to be honked, there are New Yorkers who feel that the improvement is noticeable. Cab drivers no longer lean on their horns. In fact, when policemen are nearby, New York drivers don't blow their horns at all, but just stick their heads out the windows and yell at the offenders.

Unlike the majority of antinoise measures, however, antihonking laws do not hit anyone in the pocketbook. One problem of truck noise, for instance, is that the tires create a loud and unpleasant whine, and the faster they go, the louder they are. Efforts to prohibit large trucks from traveling in populated areas at speeds over 35 to 40 miles per hour always encounter the anguished moans and steadfast resistance of the trucking lobby; and this will take more pressure than sleepless Americans have yet been able to apply.

But some successful political action has been taken toward the quieting of highway noises. Several years ago, a group of people in Westchester County, New York, formed a committee to do something about the truck noise on the Thruway.

In studying the situation, they noted that in the mid-1950s truck manufacturers had accepted—at least in theory—an industry-wide limit on exhaust noise, and they quickly discovered that at least 15 per cent of the trucks that roared past their bedroom windows nightly far exceeded that limit. Further study showed them that the trucks of certain manufacturers were much below industry standards even when new and that other trucks had simply grown noisy as they had grown old and their mufflers had been left to rot out.

Since some manufacturers *could* build quiet trucks and most truckers *could* keep them in good repair, the committee proceeded to apply pressure on the New York State Legislature to set an enforceable legal limit on truck-exhaust noises, and less than a year ago their efforts proved successful. They had been fighting for an exhaust limit of 82 decibels, but they counted themselves lucky when the legislature set a limit of 88.

It is a small success, but it is significant in that the limit is precise and measurable and therefore the police, using fairly simple apparatus, might be able to enforce it.

And there, many city planners believe, lies the problem with most antinoise statutes that currently exist in the United States. They are so vague that they are useless. As generally worded, they forbid "excessive or unusual noises," and this is a phrase that to most judges has no legal meaning at all.

To fight noise, legislatures will have to set precise limits on precise noises. And they will be able to do this only with the guidance of the scientific community. (The Thruway Noise Abatement Committee, for example, had the assistance of its own private acoustical experts, plus others provided by the state police and by the trucking industry itself.) Many other countries have set up national scientific commissions to provide such guidance, and it surely seems in the air that we will eventually do the same. We have nothing to gain by delaying it except a more intense pain in the ear.

What to do about those maddening jets? The most impressive attack (though so far with the least impressive results) being made today on the problem of noise is taking place in the field of aviation. "Noise," say state spokesmen for the Federal Aviation Agency, "is the most intense and worrisome problem now facing the aviation industry."

Just how worrisome it is can be gathered from the fact that President Johnson, who has shown little other interest in noise abate-

ment, has charged the Office of Science and Technology with the responsibility for working with NASA, the FAA, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Air Force and just about anyone else in or out of government with an interest in the matter to frame an action program to attack the problem. Difficulties, however, exist on so many levels that no solutions seem within grasp.

The main headache is that the roar of a jet engine taking off and the whine of its compressor as it lands sounds to people 300 or 400 feet under the flight path for all the world as if the thing were coming in the window. The noise interferes with their conversation, telephoning and television viewing, wakes them up at night, and is often extremely frightening. (Immediately after well-publicized airline disasters noise complaints around airports double.)

The problem did not actually begin with jets. Before they came into use, a good number of people who lived near airports were incensed by the noise from propeller aircraft. But with jets came a huge leap in the number of antinoise petitions, legal actions and baby-carriage marches.

Not only were the jets louder, they were "noisier." In other words, if your room was suddenly flooded with jet-engine sound, it would impress you as louder and more unpleasant than the same level of propeller-engine sound. This is because the jet noise is higher pitched, and high-pitched sounds are both more bothersome and (when very loud) more dangerous than low-pitched ones.

Therefore, extremely complicated scales have been developed in the attempt to compare noises in terms of how much people hate them. Using one of these scales, airports surrounding New York City have ruled that no plane taking off can make a noise more infuriating than that made by the old, propeller-driven Constellations when they were climbing about a mile from the runway. This requirement means that the jets must climb quickly for a few seconds, then reduce thrust until they are past the populated areas. But this attempt to irritate people no more than they were already irritated has so far failed.

In the first place, because of safety considerations, no airport has yet tried to set limits on the noise made by a *landing* jet. In the second place, although it took scientists a while to notice it, the constantly increasing number of flights in and out of major airports also infuriated people. It affected them to such a statistically predictable extent that a remarkable formula was worked out to say how many flights an hour, making how much noise per flight, at what times a day and what season of the year will incense a community enough to take legal action. And almost all large airports are these days well over the limit.

A few years ago, there seemed to be hope of a technological improvement of the noise level. The newly developed jet "bypass" engine could be used in a way that would produce less noise or in a way that would produce more power. But not surprisingly, the airlines chose the power, which permitted their jets to carry heavier loads. It is now beyond anyone's dreams that jets will grow quieter in the next decade. In fact, at government insistence, the struggle is being desperately waged to see that the gigantic engines for the huge, 490-passenger and supersonic jets, currently on the drawing boards, will be *no more* offensive than those of the present. But it is by no means certain that this effort will succeed.

Therefore, the only relief possible for people who must live near airports is to insulate their houses and keep their windows closed. This can be effective, although the cost is so high that a British Government Committee on the Problem of Noise recommended that grants be paid toward the sound insulation of existing homes near London's Heathrow Airport.

Americans must still lay out the cash themselves. Unless they can prove, as only a handful of people ever have, that the jet noise is actually making their property "unusable for the purposes for which it was being used," there is not even anyone to sue. Our courts have taken the position that although public-airport noise might be a nuisance, it is a legal nuisance.

It is therefore mysterious that many thousands of new homes and apartments have been springing up in recent years in the very areas most affected by aircraft noise. And probably more mysterious is that people have been moving into them. According to Walter Buechler, noise-abatement officer with the Federal Aviation Agency, one nonsoundproofed new building, half a mile beyond the end of Kennedy Airport's runway four, houses 1,400 people. "In most cases," says Mr. Buechler, "the developers were warned by this office that their tenants would be disturbed by noise. I visited one group of homeowners who had organized because of the noise problem, and I asked them if they weren't aware of the problem when they bought. They said that the real-estate dealer had told them that as soon as the area was developed, the airport would close down this runway."

It is worth knowing that the Federal Aviation Agency is prepared to tell anyone who asks how much of a current aircraft-noise problem he will run into if he moves to a given address. And this information is well worth having before signing a lease. Few people are aware of how intensely they can hate a noise until they actually find themselves living in it. As one irate homeowner told us, "I hate the noise, but even more I hate the people who tell me, 'You'll get used to it.' You never get used to it. It gets worse."

Our aircraft-noise problem, however, may hardly have begun to get worse, for in years to come no home is guaranteed to be out of its path. Studies conducted by acoustician Karl D. Kryter indicate that "with the advent of the supersonic transport, many more people, of the order of tens of millions, will be exposed to a sound that is as noisy or as objectionable as that now experienced under the flight path of jet aircraft within about one and a half miles from an airport."

Human reaction to this objectionable noise, sonic boom, which is produced in a continuous carpet 80 miles wide by aircraft flying faster than sound, was recently tested in Oklahoma City. Roughly 600,000 people were exposed to 1,253 booms over a period of about six months. These booms were produced by Air Force jets at the intensity levels expected of the new supersonic transports. The tests were conducted in daylight hours, when loud noises are known to bother the fewest people. But the result was worse than experts had expected. People did not grow used to the noise. In fact, the longer the tests progressed, the more people there were who felt they could never learn to live with such noise. By the end of the six months of testing, 27 per cent of the population found the booms completely unacceptable.

Government officials have made informal promises that these planes will be used at boom-producing speeds only over the ocean; but they have several years to reconsider this decision, and meantime, the airlines and many coast-to-coast commuters will be fighting against any restriction on speed. A New York to Los Angeles flight today takes all of five hours, and the supersonics could bring the time down under two hours. If the government eventually chooses speed over quiet, there will be for most of us no defense against sonic boom at all. It will not even be helpful to hide indoors, for the soundproofing of our homes is an art in which we are backward and which we can hardly hope to master before the supersonics are upon us.

YOUR NOISY NEIGHBOR Fred Rose, one-time delegate to the United Nation's Council on Housing and president of Rose Associates, a large New York firm that builds and rents apartment houses, has long insisted that "in the control of noise, America is woefully behind most European nations." (In all other ways, he feels, our residential construction is superior.) "In fact," says Mr. Rose, "the lowest level of European public housing has minimum standards of sound control that far surpass the best we have generally done here for our most expensive apartments and homes." There are several reasons for this. For one thing, Europeans still make much more use of traditional construction materials, such as masonry and stone, than we do. We, too, used such heavy materials in prewar buildings, and these structures are quiet, for sheer structural mass remains the most effective means known to reduce the transmission of sound. But we no longer use them. It is claimed by our builders that with our hugely increased labor costs, buildings made of such materials would be prohibitively expensive to erect. (Mr. Rose estimates that if a typical luxury apartment house of the 1920s were to be duplicated today, the tenants would have to pay rents of about $1,000 a month per room.)

With new materials and construction methods, sheer mass is no longer needed to support our buildings; but it is the tenants misfortune that the gypsum-board wall that now separates him from his neighbor is simply not as sound resistant as a foot or so of brick—in fact, it is hardly sound resistant at all.

Furthermore, in order to reduce costs and make every possible inch of enclosed space rent-producing, builders have decreased the thickness of floors separating apartments until one can hear all footsteps above. It is also economical to place bathrooms back to back, and this common practice makes of medicine cabinets virtual speaking tubes into the next apartment. Air-conditioning and elevator equipment, installed as economically as possible, sets up vibrations that are carried through the entire building structure. And huge walls of one-eighth-inch glass are extremely poor sound barriers.

There are, however, virtually no insoluble problems in this list. A good deal of sound control merely calls for employing an acoustical engineer, which most builders don't do. (No matter how thick a wall might be, if uninsulated electrical sockets pierce it from both sides, the expert is aware that noise will come through the hole; and in the design of most modern buildings that is precisely the way electrical sockets are positioned.) The rest of it is only a matter of spending cash.

Mr. Rose estimates that the cost differential between an apartment building with adequate sound control (he is careful not to say soundproofing, for elimination of sound is beyond his ability) and no sound control at all is only about five percent.

We might well ask, therefore, why we don't get it, and the answer, as Mr. Rose explains, is that "until recently there has been no requirement for sound control in any building code in the United States. There is no other civilized Western country in which this state of affairs exists."

Without codes that weigh equally on all and therefore disadvantage none, most builders have concluded that money spent on sound control would be money they would never get back, for if they charged rents five percent higher than their competitors, they would be left with empty space.

Belatedly, however, we are now making a first few timid steps toward incorporating sound control requirements in two of our building codes. Two years ago, the Federal Housing Authority implemented the first such code in the nation. It affects the 13 or 14 percent of the housing built in the

United States each year with loans insured by the FHA. And about the same time, the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn composed a code of minimal sound-transmission standards for New York City apartment buildings that seems likely to be adopted in the very near future. The two codes are quite similar.

To oversimplify a good deal, the New York code calls for walls and floor-ceiling constructions that reduce airborne sound by at least 45 decibels. According to Michael J. Kodaras, consultant on the New York City code, "A man would have to shout at the top of his voice to be heard on the other side of the wall. Most men, when adequately provoked, can shout at levels up to ninety-two decibels," says Mr. Kodaras, "but the ambient noise level (the soupy mixture of millions of faint background noises) in New York is high enough to wash out most of the other forty-seven decibels that get through."

Much the opposite of what one might expect, the FHA code demands that walls built in the country be better at blocking noise than walls built in cities. The reason is that ambient noise in the country is lower, so individual noises stand out more and annoy more. And that explains why the baby sleeps well in Boston but is wakened by bird chirps on Nantucket.

The new codes also call for floor-ceiling constructions that have been found to dampen the clacking of women's high heels to an extent that satisfies 75 percent of the people subjected to it in the apartments below.

But these requirements are minimums. Hopefully, many builders will exceed them. And over the years, Mr. Kodaras feels certain that other cities will adopt them and the minimums will be raised.

Quite obviously, however, the huge majority of us for many years to come will be living in acoustically deplorable homes, erected in these continuing dark ages after the days of good materials and before the days of codes. Almost all we can do is put down carpeting, and thus make life a bit more tolerable for the people downstairs, and install air conditioning for ourselves. The closed windows will keep out some of the street noises, and if we can stand it, the sound of rushing air produced by the machine will mask many minor noises that would otherwise irritate.

Poetic acousticians refer to this rush of air-conditioning noise as "sound perfume." Acoustical consultants Bolt Baranek and Newman, of Cambridge, have built it into many air-conditioning systems on purpose—to drown out, as examples, the sound of researchers researching in Time-Life editorial offices and the swish slide rules and tapping of pencils in the M.I.T. library.

And the air-condiitoning noise itself has been copied in the form of "white noise" machines. A New York sleep shop, says one of its salesmen, sells eight of these a day. Placed next to one's pillow, they create the sounds of air conditioning without the cold air. For suburbanites lacking the good, rich, ambient sounds of the city, they smother the irritating chirps of crickets and frogs, and for city dwellers they exclude those neighborly voices that are just too faint to make out. "Of all noises, faint ones might well be the most damaging to the human psyche," says Dr. Farr. "If you could actually hear what your neighbors were shouting at each other, either you would find it interesting, in which case it would no longer be noise, or you would dismiss it as inconsequential and roll over and go back to sleep. But it is very frustrating when voices are loud enough to break into your consciousness but not loud enough to be understood."

Nothing could demonstrate the complexity of fighting noise more than one's own confusion on this issue. Faint noises through the wall are indeed intolerable; but it must be decided on a case-by-case basis whether to call the neighbor to say "Pipe down" or "Speak up."

A NOISE-LOATHER RENTS A NEW APARTMENT. If there are old tenants, she talks with them and begs them to let her visit between ten and eleven at night. Then she listens for the elevator, steps in the hall, footsteps overhead, toilets flushing, noise through the walls. If all seems well, she talks to as many other tenants in the building as she can. If they are disturbed by noise, they will certainly not hide it from her, for under the circumstances, they probably detest the landlord and would be delighted if he lost money on an empty apartment.

If it is a new building, she visits it with a friend who is carrying a transistor radio in her purse. The friend goes into the next apartment and turns the radio up to a normal loud level. If the sound comes through clearly, she is not deceived by the rental agent's assurance that once rugs and furniture are in, they will muffle such noises.

The friend flushes the toilets next door. No sound of it should get through.

The friend, in high heels, walks briskly about in the apartment upstairs. A very slight tapping sound might be acceptable—provided the landlord guarantees that there is a so-called carpet clause in everyone's lease. This should provide that 85 per cent of the flooring in all apartments (except kitchens and bathrooms) will be carpeted. The landlord must also guarantee that carpeting will cover all the hallway floors.

She makes certain that the bedrooms are not next to the elevator shaft. Also, she assures herself that her bedrooms do not share walls with someone else's living room.

She is particularly suspicious of bathroom cabinets and air vents and spends an inordinate amount of time attempting to talk with her friend from one bathroom to another.

She also spends time staring out all the windows. Does she see a school playground, a garage? Is that a fire station down the block? Is she in the landing path of the airport? (She later checks that with the Federal Aviation Agency.) All this will be of vital importance if she hopes to raise the windows in the summer.

But no matter how hard she tries, she might still fail miserably. Many a horror story can be told. There was the noise-phobic couple who spent years searching for the old town house of their dreams. It had to be a one-family house and on a quiet street and with walls as thick as those of a fortress. They finally found it—and went deeply in debt to buy it. But the first night they spent in it, there was a reverberation that turned on and off—a deep hum that came from nowhere and murdered sleep. A noise expert told them it was their boiler, so they went further into debt and bought a new $3,000 boiler. And there is still, to this very night, six months later, a reverberation that turns on and off. Noise experts now tell them it is the boiler in the house next door, and they are both very close to going out of their minds.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 31, 1966]

SLOW ON SOUND

(By Mary Hornaday)

NEW YORK.—Robert Alex Baron, a theater manager, lives right over the Sixth Avenue subway, three years in the building.

This is one reason the bulky, blond young man has become a citizen leader in the battle against "noise pollution."

Looking down on a big crane and earth-packing machines one morning recently when he was baby-sitting for his daughter, Stacy, he explained:

"For one whole year we were subject to the most intense and longest siege of noise in the history of modern man. It went on from 7:30 in the morning til 4:30 in the evening, five days a week. You won't believe this but our daughters first words were: 'Noisy street. Daddy, stop noisy street!' It is very sad."

It is not only the subway that is troubling Mr. Baron. Next door they are tearing down the Ziegfeld Theater. On top of that there are the usual noises—sirens, sanitation trucks, loudspeakers, and car horns. There is an unsilenced helicopter in the center of the city, and soon there may be the booms from breaking the sound barrier.

Retreat from the city? That isn't what Mr. Baron intends. Instead he has set about to mobilize public support for noise abatement—at least on the local level and eventually nationwide. "There probably will have to be federal guidelines," Mr. Baron says, "since many of the noises come from interstate traffic." Last summer he addressed the International Congress for Noise Abatement in Baden-Baden, Germany. His address was inserted in the Congressional Record by Rep. Theodore R. Kupferman (R) of New York who has legislation in Congress to control noise pollution.

As far back as 1929, New York City started to tackle its noise problem with the New York City Noise Abatement Commission. Today the city has a basic law against unnecessary noises—described as "of such character, intensity, and duration as to be detrimental to the life or health of any individual. Penalties for a first offense ran from five dollars to $10, but since punishment comes under criminal law, Mr. Baron finds judges "very reluctant to convict."

One happy note in New York's noise picture is the city's proposed new building code. For the first time, it will require walls thick enough to keep out neighbors' noises and plumbing that does not rattle and shake at night. "It's very exciting," Mr. Baron concedes. "But will it be enforced?" That will be part of his work—stir up citizen support for adoption of the new code and its enforcement.

At present the most active citizen groups in the noise abatement field are fighting noise from jet aircraft. But Mr. Baron thinks a more general mobilization of public support is needed. Also he says there is a dearth of leadership from public officials busy on air and water pollution but slow on sound.

One of Mr. Baron's insistences is that when new noises are introduced in the "public sector," they be toned down before they are introduced. He foresees that the United States may make a lot of enemies overseas if it launches its supersonic plane without proper attention to the supersonic boom.

"Countries that do not have the plane are going to react especially severely to overflights," he worries.

Mr. Baron has started speaking to women's clubs and other citizen groups about the noise problem. "My purpose," he says, "is to tell people they don't have to give up." He pulls out of his file information on silencers, many of them made abroad. They are apparently unknown in New York.

Sometimes, Mr. Baron admits, "one man's noise may be another man's music."

The hooting tugboats in the night on the East River come in that category.

Some light-sleeping New Yorkers don't even like them. It is Mr. Baron's contention that even these people should be shown respect as human beings.

The citizen campaign against noise pollution in big cities will probably take a long time. Here in New York, it has begun.

[From the Rochester Times Union]

Q. Your editorial page referred to the problem of increasing noise and suggested that interested citizens do something about it. To whom can I write, on national and local levels, to urge that steps be taken to combat the ever-growing noise problem?

—E. H., ROCHESTER.

A. City Councilman William A. Legg has proposed a review of city and state laws dealing with noisy vehicles. Greece Supervisor George W. Badgerow this year proposed an anti-noise ordinance for his town.

U.S. Rep. Theodore R. Kupferman of Manhattan wants a U.S. director of noise control in the Surgeon General's Office. The Acoustical Society of America at 335 E. 45th St. in New York City is made up of scientists trying to control noises. "Help" suggests you contact one of those.

STATE OF COLORADO,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Denver, Colo., January 3, 1967.

Congressman THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KUPFERMAN: I noticed your article in the Autumn 1966 "Engineer" and this prompted me to ask you for further information pertaining to noise in general, and any ideas you have leading to the suppression of noise. I would appreciate receiving a copy of your Bill HR 14602 plus accompanying Report.

It is good to know that someone at your level is becoming concerned about noise and the problems it creates. Noise seems to be one of the unfortunate by-products of our advancing technology; I am sure it is reducing the efficiency of many of us and actually hurting some of us.

It would seem that were we to put our minds to it, some place in our technology there could be set aside sufficient personnel and the time and equipment to work toward suppression and abatement of noise production.

Yours very truly,

WM. N. GAHR,
Chief Engineer and Director, Division of Engineering and Sanitation.

PANCOAST, FERENDINO, GRAFTON & SKEELS, ARCHITECTS,
November 18, 1966.

Subject: Sound control legislation and technology.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our staff mechanical engineer has called to my attention your article in the autumn, 1966, issue of "Engineer" entitled, "noise, the need for legislation and technology." The article contains so much information pertinent to our local problems in this area that I request permission to reproduce it for distribution to the members of the Board of Public Instruction, the superintendent and his staff, and local building code board of rules and appeals. By way of an exchange of information, and to indicate to you the nature, and cost to the public, of our local noise problem, I am sending to you under separate cover two reports prepared for the Board of Public Instruction. One of these was written by staff members of the B. P. I., and the other by Dariel Fitzroy, who was consulted at the recommendation of our office at the suggestion of Harold Gores, president of Educational Facilities Laboratories, a beneficiary of the Ford Foundation.

The further study of this problem in the greater Miami area and the implementation of zoning regulations to prevent further pollution of our acoustical environment would make very good use of funds for research and demonstration projects to be provided under your bill H.R. 14608, or similar legislation. That the metropolitan government of the community might be receptive to regulations is evident by the passage of a model air pollution ordinance which has helped protect us from the private power industry use of heavy fuel oil for generator plants. The existence of a natural gas line from Texas has made possible the substitution of cleaner fuel for public power generation in a resort area where clean environment is of paramount importance.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. CHURCH,
Director of School Construction Research.

TUSTIN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
November 11, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: I was much impressed with your article "Noise: The Need for Legislation and Technology," which appeared in the Autumn, 1966 issue of Engineer. Does your office happen to have extra copies? We could make good use of any number up to 30. May we quote from your article in our technical publications?

By a copy of this letter I am asking Mr. Jack Mowry, President of Acoustical Publications, Inc., Box 9665, Cleveland, Ohio 44140, and Publisher of *Sound and Vibration*, to put you on his mailing list (first issue in January). You mention Mr. Lewis S. Goodfriend, who edits the new magazine. Perhaps the magazine will comment on your article if you will send Mr. Mowry a copy.

In reading your article, I was impressed with your unusually fine understanding of and writing about this complex subject. Similar understanding must be gained, somehow, by members of all local, regional and national legislative bodies. Also to people responsible for enforcing noise codes, including police departments. Also to those people responsible for generating noise.

Our business is specialized technical education. One of our fields is applied acoustics, emphasizing applications rather than theory. If you happen to hear of people who desire a short, concentrated course of instruction, would you kindly mention us?

Yours very truly,

WAYNE TUSTIN.

OHIO RIVER VALLEY
WATER SANITATION COMMISSION,
Cincinnati, Ohio, December 12, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: If reprints are available of your statements with attachments that appeared in the Congressional Record of April 21 and October 19, 1966, I would be pleased to receive them.

May I congratulate you on your informative presentations of the "noise pollution" problem and the recommendations you have set forth to deal with it. I did have opportunity to glance at them, but they capture my interest for further study.

More power to you in giving leadership to this vital aspect of improving the quality of our environment.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. CLEARY.

WESTCREST COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., November 19, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE KUPFERMAN,
Seventeenth Congressional District,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KUPFERMAN: In the Autum 1966 edition of "Engineer" there appeared your article entitled "Noise: the Need for Legislation and Technology". The subject is of vital interest to us.

We are residing immediately to the south of a small airport, which is not within Los Angeles city boundaries. However, the flight pattern is directly over the residential communities of *our* city—not theirs.

For the most part, the airport has been used as a recreational facility accommodating light craft, and occasional military and emergency flights. The field has now been open to jet traffic and there are plans to expand for the purpose of accommodating private Industries "Executive" type Jets.

The increasing noise emanating from the airport was recently measured at 102 dbs. from the home of one of our residents. We know some areas to have a higher noise level than the example cited, but a complete noise study has not yet been made.

If you have any further information you can send us regarding "noise", its effects, and what can be done about it, we would be most appreciative. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

WESTCREST COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION,
ROBERT E. CLOON, *President.*

MENANDS, N.Y.,
November 30, 1966.

Congressman THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KUPFERMAN: Your speech on "Noise," published in the recent issue of "Engineer," stimulates my interest as well as imagination to control the unwanted sound that is present in our noisy environment.

I am a sanitary engineer and am interested in having a copy of your proposed bill, H.R. 14608, if available.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS SHEN.

[From the Scientific American, December 1966]

NOISE

(NOTE.—There is widespread concern that the noisy environment of modern man not only is distracting but also causes damage to the ear. What are the facts of the matter, and how can noise be brought under control?)

(By Leo L. Beranek)

Mankind seems destined to live in an increasingly noisy environment. The growth of population and the proliferation of machines are steadily raising the noise level, not only in our cities but also in the countryside. More and more we are exposed to a babble of technological noises that disturb our sleep, make conversation difficult, create anxiety and in many cases may result in a permanent impairment of hearing.

Although the noise problem has been widely discussed and studied for many years, it has not yet been dealt with in any thoroughgoing way. In several sectors of our technology, however, it has recently presented itself in an acute form. A crisis was precipitated for a considerable part of U.S. industry by a court decision in the state of New York in 1948. Matthew Slawinski, a dropforge worker, had filed a claim against his employer for compensation for partial deafness caused by the high noise level in the shop where he worked. Eventually the New York State Court of Appeals upheld his plea that he had suffered an occupational disability (although he was able to continue at full pay as a drop-forge worker), and he was awarded $1,661.25. The decision was soon followed by the filing of hundreds of claims against employers by workers in noisy industries in many other states. Management alarm in these industries—textile mills, drop-forge and metal-fabricating shops, steel mills, metal-container plants and others—rose to near-panic proportions, and a member of the Wisconsin Industrial Commission estimated that the total of claims for occupational loss of hearing in the U.S. might rise to billions of dollars.

Industry was given a reprieve by later judicial elaboration, in New York and elsewhere, of the original ruling. It is now held that to establish a claim a worker must retire from his noisy occupation for some months in order to determine whether or not his hearing loss is permanent. Since most workers do not wish to give up months of wages (or their occupation) for the chancy

opportunity to sue for a compensation award, the surge of claims has subsided.

Nevertheless, industry has not entirely recovered from its scare, and other noise sources—notably the rising din of automobile and airplane traffic—are creating active public concern and demands for remedies. It is clear that the basic problem is essentially incurable; noise is an unavoidable price we must pay for a machine civilization. But if we cannot eliminate the noise of modern technology, we can at least control it to minimize its effects. The problem of control has three main aspects: technical, economic and political.

EFFECTS ON HEARING

Let us consider first what has been learned about the effects of noise on the human organism. The most obvious effect, of course, is on the hearing organ. Everyone knows that a very loud noise, such as the explosion of a large firecracker, will produce momentary deafness. Permanent hearing loss, however, develops only from repeated or continuous exposure to high noise levels. The relation between such exposure and hearing impairment has been investigated carefully in a number of studies.

To understand the results of these tests one must know something about the methods of measurement. The intensity of sound is measured in decibels, and a person's hearing is measured in terms of the threshold decibel levels at which his ear can detect sounds at given frequencies. The amount of an individual's "hearing loss" can therefore be gauged by comparing his acuity with an average or standard of hearing sensitivity; if, for instance, a sound must be raised to 15 decibels above the standard for him to hear it, he is said to have suffered a 15-decibel hearing loss. In the U.S. the standard for average hearing has been established by the American Standards Association on the basis of tests of a large group of people between 18 and 30 years of age without hearing difficulties.

As is well known, the audibility and quality of sounds depend a great deal on frequency. The frequencies up to 3,000 cycles per second are the most important for understanding speech. Higher frequencies are generally judged "noisier" and more annoying (although they are essential for full enjoyment of music). It is at the higher frequencies that hearing losses become most marked with advancing age or in the impairment due to exposure to noise. Hearing tests generally examine the subject's sensitivity in a series of bands; each band consists of an octave, that is, the highest frequency in it is twice that of the lowest.

Here are the results of a classic study of 400 men engaged in a noisy occupation. They had worked daily at a noise level averaging 90 decibels in each of the six octave bands between 100 and 6,000 cycles per second, some of them for periods of up to 40 years. On the average the men suffered substantial hearing losses, particularly at the higher frequencies and during the early years of their exposure. Some of those who had been exposed for 10 years, even young men of 30, had so much impairment that they found it difficult to understand speech.

The study showed that individuals differ considerably in their vulnerability to noise: among those who had been exposed for 25 years or more there was a spread of about 30 decibels in the amount of hearing loss at the higher frequencies. The variation in vulnerability suggests that it should be possible to discover at a fairly early stage those persons who are particularly susceptible to hearing impairment and transfer them to quieter jobs. The damaging effect of noise is especially marked and prompt in showing itself at the frequency of 4,000 cycles per second; hence this test should be a good indicator for identifying noise-susceptible people. By way of comparison, a separate study of individuals who pursued quiet occupations has shown in detail how hearing at the high frequencies deteriorates with age. Among men in their 60's the average loss of hearing at these frequencies is about 30 decibels, and in the 70's the loss rises to some 40 decibels or more.

PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS

When we move into other realms of noise effects, such as the psychological consequences, it is hard to find a basis for measurement. The noises of our daily life have been blamed variously for the high divorce rate, social conflict, indigestion and other organic disabilities, nervous breakdown, high blood pressure, heart failure and even insanity. Most of these allegations arise from overvivid imaginations, but one cannot rule out the possibility that some people are particularly sensitive to noise just as others are allergic to nuts, eggs or household dust. As far as controlled social observations go, however, we can only say that the demonstrable and important biological effects of loud noises are—in addition to the impairment of hearing—interference with speech communication, distraction of people from work requiring concentration, interference with sleep and a subjective reaction of annoyance.

Studies of the annoyance effect have been conducted among people living in noisy areas: in central London, near the London airport and in several U.S. cities, some of them near military air bases. Thousands of people were interviewed, and some interesting statistics have emerged. In any noisy environment, whatever the intensity of the noise, about a fourth of the inhabitants say they are not perturbed by the noisy activities. These people apparently are able to live happily next to elevated railroads, trucking routes, airplane flight paths and other loud noise sources. At the other extreme, about a tenth of those interviewed seem to be disturbed by almost any noise not of their own making, regardless of how faint it may be. (The interviews elicited the fact that the same people were dissatisfied with many other things in their environment.)

In areas where a specific source (such as airplanes) produces a constant din, about a third of the people said they tended to get used to the noise; on the other hand, a fourth said they were increasingly bothered by the noise as time went on. Personal reactions to noise did not appear to be correlated to any significant extent with age, sex, income or education. Many people were, however, influenced by specific fears; many of those who lived next to traffic routes said they were sensitive to the noise because of fear for the safety of their children; many of those near airports dreaded the noise because of the possibility of plane crashes. We should not minimize the annoyance effect of noise. Some physiologists assert that annoyance is a biological protective mechanism (like the discomforts of fatigue, hunger or cold) that impels the organism to avoid noise as it does other signals of disturbance.

NOISE CONTROL

Let us turn now to what has been done, and what can be done, to control noise in the areas of greatest concern. Foremost among these areas, of course, is industry, where continual exposure may seriously damage the workers' hearing.

The first need is to determine what the tolerable levels are, and a number of studies have been devoted to this question. A committee of the American Standards Association, in an investigation that is still under way, has arrived at some preliminary ideas on permissible limits of noise exposure for a worker at his daily job. The test applied by the committee is that after 10 years of the daily exposure a worker should not have suffered any appreciable impairment of his ability to understand speech at normal voice levels. On the basis of this criterion the committee investigators have determined permissible daily "quotas" of exposure, that is, the number of minutes of exposure per day that can be tolerated at various decibel levels and for various sound frequencies. The committee's tentative conclusion is that over an eight-hour working day 85 decibels (for each of the octave-band frequencies above 700 cycles per second) is about the limit people can tolerate without substantial damage to their hearing. A study by the U.S. Navy has suggested that a higher figure is permissible; testing naval personnel, it found that daily exposure up to 90 decibels did not impair the men's ability to understand speech.

The noisy industries themselves have begun to take steps to reduce the risk of hearing loss. Most of the employers in these industries now test the hearing of workers when they are hired and at intervals afterward. They often require workers in the noisy locations to wear earplugs, earmuffs or both. Many factories are applying mufflers and other noise-reducers to their machines, building enclosures around them and covering the room walls with sound-absorbing materials. Some companies go so far as to specify, when buying new machinery, that the machines must not generate noise above a stated level.

At the political level a few states have adopted legislation requiring employers in noisy plants to provide earplugs or earmuffs for their workers. In California the state Department of Industrial Relations has issued a noise-control safety order specifying the circumstances under which ear protection must be worn. It is required, for example, if the worker is exposed for more than five hours a day to 95 decibels or more in any one of the octave-band frequencies above 300 cycles per second.

A number of states now have laws that give workers the right to claim compensation if they have suffered a loss of ability to understand speech, even though this may not have meant the loss of their jobs. The Council of State Governments has recommended a uniform law for all the states that would specify the conditions for compensation claims. It defines noise-induced hearing loss as a compensable disability and establishes a disability scale based on the average of the hearing loss measured at 500, 1,000 and 2,000 cycles per second. The compensable loss would be that beyond 15 decibels, after deducting the natural loss due simply to aging (which is specified as half a decibel per year after the age of 40). The recommended legislation also includes provisions designed to protect employers: workers could file claims only after six months of separation from exposure to noise and the employer's responsibility would be limited to the amount of hearing loss incurred by the worker with this employer (that is, excluding losses in previous jobs).

NOISE AND SPEECH

I want at this point to discuss in a little more detail the loss of the ability to understand speech, to which I have already referred so often in this article. The word-comprehension test has proved to be a remarkably useful aid to noise research, not only because it provides a convenient way to measure hearing loss but also because it serves as a criterion for establishing permissible noise limits in almost all types of situation. The analysis of speech sounds and of effects of noise on speech comprehension has therefore given us invaluable information.

Laboratory studies with sound-recording devices tell us that speech is made up of a great variety of sounds at various frequencies and intensities. Each letter or syllable, as normally enunciated, carries a mixture of tones, each with a certain characteristic intensity. Consider the word "sit." The sound of "s" consists of relatively high-pitched tones at a moderate intensity level;

"i" is lower-pitched and stronger in intensity; "t" is made up mainly of high-frequency tones at low intensity, so that its sound is comparatively faint. Now, to understand the word when it is spoken a listener must hear and unambiguously identify each letter. If he fails to catch the "t," he may mistake "sit" for "six"; if he misses the "i" sound, he cannot tell whether the word is "sit" or "sat." Laboratory tests have in fact demonstrated that to understand English speech perfectly one needs to hear essentially all its sounds over the frequency range from 200 to 6,000 cycles per second. It has been found that this spectrum can be divided into some 20 bands, all of which prove to be equally important for speech intelligibility. It also turns out that within each band the intensity of the various speech sounds (for letters and syllables) as they are ordinarily enunciated varies over a range of about 30 decibels (from the faintest to the most intense). We can therefore plot on a graph the region of speech intelligibility, in terms of the necessary decibel levels for the various frequencies.

As a standard for reference we can plot the "speech region" in the case of a young male speaker talking at a normal voice level and standing about three feet from the listener. If the speaker talks softly, the entire speech region moves down about six decibels (that is, all the sounds are that much fainter); if he raises his voice above the normal level, the region rises six decibels above the standard; if he shouts, the region moves up another six decibels. The sound level for the listener also varies with distance between the speaker and the listener: for each doubling of the distance the speech sounds become six decibels fainter, and for each halving of the distance they become six decibels louder.

Now, if we plot on the same graph the threshold levels of audibility of sounds for persons with average or normal hearing, we can readily measure the effects of loss of hearing ability. Whenever a person's hearing loss is such that his audibility threshold rises into the normal speech region, he will fail to hear the speech sounds at the affected frequencies and to that extent will suffer a loss of speech comprehension.

The effects of interfering noise can be shown even more graphically. Noises at decibel levels within the speech region will mask, or blot out, the speech sounds. There are continuous-spectrum noises, such as those of a waterfall, a jet engine or a moving train, that will overwhelm the speech region at all frequencies. Thus a railroad train approaching a station where two persons are talking makes it more and more difficult for the two to understand each other, and at its peak the train noise may make speech impossible. By raising their voices and moving closer together, thereby elevating their speech region, the two speakers may be able to achieve a slight measure of communication. There is a level, however, at which speech can be too loud to be understood. A person shouting into a listener's ear may so overload the ear that the speech sounds become unrecognizable.

From the type of analysis I have been describing we can derive information that enables us to set up definite criteria for noise control in our various working and living spaces: offices, conference rooms, shops, homes and outdoor locations. In our laboratory at Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., we have worked out a scale of speech-interference level (SIL) that can be used as a guide for determining the permissible limits of background noise in given situations. The scale defines background noise in terms of a kind of decibel specially created for the purpose: the SILdB. This unit is an average of the decibel readings in the three octave bands between 600 and 4,800 cycles per second. For instance, in the case of two persons six feet apart outdoors, one speaker will readily make himself understood by speaking in a normal voice if the interfering noise level is no louder than 49 SILdB; against a background of 55 SILdB he will have to raise his voice; at 67 SILdB he must shout.

Using this scale, we have derived the following criteria for specific situations. In a private office or small conference room, where the people may be separated by distances of 10 to 25 feet, the speech-interference level of the background noise should be no higher than 30 to 35 SILdB, so that conversation can be carried on at normal voice levels. In large engineering and drafting rooms, where people may stand closer together (about six feet apart) and be willing to raise their voices, a noise level of 40 to 50 SILdB is tolerable. In the home, if we apply a standard of quietness that would allow the television or radio to be understood comfortably at moderate levels of loudness, the interfering noise level should be no more than 30 to 35 SILdB. For telephone conversation the interfering noise should be no more than 45 SILdB; above that level background noise begins to make telephone communication difficult, and when it reaches 75 SILdB use of the telephone may become impossible. In all situations the highest noise level that will allow any intelligible communication is about 90 SILdB; against this background the speaker must shout into the listener's ear from a distance of three to six inches.

QUIETER BUILDINGS

What can be done to make our buildings, particularly dwellings, quieter? Certainly we must give more thought to their basic design. In contemporary architecture the primary emphasis seems to be not on function but on aesthetics. Two of the principal ideals are transparency and continuity—in physical terms, glass and the open plan. Unfortunately continuous structures and open plans are inimical to quiet living. Many modern dwellings are acoustical torture chambers!

In apartment buildings the errors of design are compounded by economic pressures that have resulted in a too flimsy separation between apartments. Many new high-rise apartment buildings in New York are so noisy that their occupancy rates have fallen below the profitable level. Apartment hunters have been known to carry portable radios with them so that they can test the noise transfer from one apartment to the next. Some owners of cooperative apartments are compelled to spend large sums to insulate their dwellings more satisfactorily against the noise of their neighbors.

The difficulty is not that techniques for making dwellings quiet are unavailable. Noise can be controlled by erecting heavier or multilayered walls between apartments, by floating floors or hanging ceilings from vertical structural members, by installing nearly silent bathroom fixtures, by designing ventilation ducts to minimize the transmission of noise and by using quiet systems of air conditioning. Indeed, it is possible with present techniques to build apartments (or offices, libraries and hospitals) that are actually too quiet—so silent that even faint noises from outside become obtrusive and disturbing. In that case there is a simple and pleasant remedy: one can introduce a gentle, steady, "white" noise—a noise "perfume" that masks the intrusive noises and has a soothing effect.

In Europe long experience in apartment living and a popular taste for gracious living (in preference to gadgets) have led to careful attention to noise control in the construction of multiple-family dwellings. Britain, the Netherlands, Germany, Sweden, and the U.S.S.R. have well-developed acoustical building codes that have been applied to the large-scale program of the rebuilding of housing since World War II.

Studies have shown that the noises apartment dwellers consider most annoying are radio or television noise from neighboring apartments and impact noises, as from people moving about on the floor above. It is not possible to achieve accurate control of the transmission of such noises simply by specifying construction requirements for walls and floors, because noise can travel from one room to another along continuous walls and through cracks, ventilation ducts, electric boxes, pipes, conduits or medicine cabinets. Therefore the codes focus on specifying limits for the amount of noise that may be transmitted, leaving it to the builders to devise means of complying with these limits. The amount of transmission is tested by devices such as a pounding machine that hammers on a floor so that the reception of noise in a room below can be measured. A general formula for rating the insulating value of floors, ceilings and walls has been devised: it is based on the difference in noise level (at 16 significant frequencies) between the room where the noise originates and the one where it is received.

The Netherlands code specifies, for example, that a loud noise must be so muffled that the noise level at 2,000 cycles per second is 54 decibels lower in the receiving room. (Less attenuation of noise is required, however, at lower frequencies.) In Britain, which has separate standards for Grade I and Grade II (less expensive) structures, the minimum absorption requirements for noise at 2,000 cycles per second are 56 and 51 decibels respectively.

In the U.S. such codes are entirely lacking, and only New York is seriously considering one. A proposed code for that city would set the insulation requirement (at 2,000 cycles per second) at 45 decibels—six decibels less satisfactory than even the Grade II code in Britain. Even so, the proposed New York standard would be an improvement over present conditions there. In many of its present apartment buildings the noise insulation is 10 or more decibels worse than the proposed code.

The control of apartment noise in the U.S. will be a most difficult matter. Building codes are strictly local; each of the nation's 6,000 cities and towns writes its own code. Labor is slow to accept new building techniques. Builders, under the pressure of competition, are governed primarily by economic considerations. Many argue that to attain in the U.S. the standards of quietness now enjoyed in modern apartments in Europe (where building costs are much lower) would require the development of new types of lightweight apartment structures that would be cheaper to build in terms of materials and labor costs.

Nevertheless, it seems that the time is near when we can expect noise-control codes throughout the nation. The Federal Housing Administration is supporting a comprehensive study of the control of noise in multiunit dwellings. This study may in time lead to Federal noise-control requirements for housing built under FHA mortgages. Moreover, if New York adopts a noise code, other cities undoubtedly will follow its lead. It seems likely that public demand, expressing itself through codes and in the marketplace through a deliberate search for quiet in apartment hunting, will compel increasing attention to noise control in apartment construction. Among other things, it should stimulate research on reducing the cost of building quiet into our dwellings.

VEHICULAR NOISE

We consider next the noise of our vehicles. In retrospect the clip-clop of horses and the rumbling of carriages seem the sounds of an idyllic way of life. Our drive to be continually on the move and to travel ever more rapidly has created a noise nuisance that already has reached awesome proportions and becomes increasingly difficult to live with. In a British government survey of residents

of central London, in which some 1,400 people were questioned, traffic noise stood at the top of the list of things in the environment that people would most like to change. The din of motor-vehicle traffic was considered more annoying than all other noises put together; four to seven times as many people were disturbed by this noise as by the noise of airplanes, trains or industry.

It is abundantly clear, therefore, that if city living is to be made tolerably quiet, the first efforts must be directed to reducing the noise of motor traffic. We cannot banish the automobiles, buses and trucks; they are a necessary part of our lives. It does not follow, however, that we must put up with all the noise now created by these machines.

The levels of noise produced by various types of motor vehicle have been measured carefully on the basis of their irritating effect on hearers. This measure depends not only on the physical energy of the noise but also on the hearer's perception of its loudness, or "noisiness." Noise-measuring instruments have a standard setting—the "A" scale—that gives extra weight to the higher frequencies; these variations in sound pressure are recorded in special units called dBA. Using the A scale, a study of motor traffic on California freeways showed that the noisiness level of passenger cars (for a hearer nearby) ranges from about 60 to 78 dBA at 30 miles per hour and rises to about 72 to 90 dBA at 70 miles per hour. The wide spread is due to the fact that old cars, with their worn mufflers, are considerably noisier than new ones. The study showed in quantitative terms that the main noisemakers on the freeways are trucks, buses, motorcycles and sports cars. The average trucks at 60 miles per hour is about twice as noisy as a steady stream of passenger-car traffic, and its noise may be well above 100 dBA. The irritating effect of these vehicles is heightened by the startling impact of their loud bursts of noise as they arrive at unpredictable intervals in the traffic stream.

The state of California is considering legislation that would prohibit noise levels above 82 dBA for passenger cars and 92 dBA for trucks and buses. In Britain the national government proposes to limit the maximum permissible noise to 85 dBA for passenger cars and trucks and 90 dBA for motorcycles and other two-wheeled vehicles. France has already established limits of 83 dBA for passenger cars and small trucks, 86 dBA for motorcycles and 90 dBA for large trucks and buses.

It must be said that leaving the problem to state and local legislation in the U.S. would not be effective. So much motor traffic, particularly trucking, is interstate today that national laws are plainly called for. Motor-vehicle noise is one form of hubub that should not be too difficult to control. Highway builders today have available materials for producing quiet road surfaces. The latest passenger cars generally have effective mufflers and quiet tire treads. Trucks can be equippedwith adequate mufflers and noise-damping housing for their engines. We can have quieter as well as safer vehicles.

What can be done about airplane noise? There is no doubt that we shall soon be exposed to a greatly increased volume of noise from this source as air traffic and airports multiply, helicopters become more widely used and supersonic airplanes usher in an era of sonic booms. It is difficult to determine what the tolerable levels of airplane noise are, because they vary widely among individuals and are conditioned by people's attitudes, such as their fear of crashes, their feelings on the subject of whether or not the airlines and airports are concerned about their welfare, and so forth. My own interpretation of the studies that have been made among people living near airports is that for most people the noise begins to become unbearably annoying when the airplane noise peaks (in 20 to 40 daytime flyovers per day) exceed a "perceived noise" level (measured in another special unit) around 115 PNdB. Annoyance rises (or tolerance declines) if the number of flyovers or the duration of noise in each flyover is increased, and tolerance also drops sharply at night. Some studies indicate that a flyover seems to sound 10 or more PNdB noisier after 10:00 p.m. than it does during daytime hours.

The London airport and Kennedy International Airport in New York have set up noise limits for jet airplane takeoffs (but not landings) that are in accord with these figures. In London the takeoff is supposed not to exceed 110 PNdB during the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 11:10 p.m. and after 11:00 p.m. the allowance is lowered to 102 PNdB. At Kennedy the permissible limit for takeoffs over land is 112 PNdB; at night the jets are usually required to take off over water.

The Federal Aviation Agency, which operates the Washington National Airport, has been experimenting with takeoff patterns designed to minimize noise in the surrounding residential areas. Jet airplanes are required to climb as steeply as possible to an altitude of about 1,500 feet and then coast on minimal power up to 3,000 feet. To avoid flying directly over houses in the early part of the takeoff the plane is also required to follow the Potomac River as it climbs.

For the noisy landings of jet airplanes, made particularly irritating by the whine of their engine-intake compressors, ameliorating maneuvers are not yet feasible. Most pilots believe for safety's sake they must come in to the landing strip at a low glide angle. To approach at a steeper angle—say six or eight degrees instead of three degrees—would require, they insist, several improvements in airplane design: better instrumentation (perhaps computer control of the landing), better engine response and better plane-handling qualities.

Many things could be done to design airplanes for less noisy operation. Prompted by regulations of the Port of New York Authority, operator of Kennedy and other airports, airplane manufacturers have fitted silencing devices to the exhaust ports of turbojet engines. The new turbofan type of engine has increased thrust greatly without a proportional increase in noise (but unfortunately it cannot be quieted appreciably by silencers). Some manufacturers of jet airplanes are studying the possibility of mounting the engine nacelles above instead of under the wings, so that the wings will prevent much of the noise from reaching the ground. Designers can also think of ways to control noises by modifications of the engines, nacelles and wings, and it is believed refinements of design would allow airplanes to climb and land at steeper angles. These cost-incurring antinoise improvements are not likely to be undertaken, however, until the Federal Aviation Agency forces their adoption by spelling out limits on the noise that will be tolerated from new airplanes.

SUPERSONIC-AIRPLANE NOISE

Ahead of us lies the prospect of sonic booms from the next generation of airplanes—the supersonic transport (SST). The coming of supersonic travel is inevitable; we must prepare to control its effects. The tests that have been conducted so far suggest that sonic booms need not be destructive and that people may be more apprehensive about the phenomenon than they need to be.

When an airplane moves faster than the speed of sound, it produces shock waves that trail in the wake of the plane like the disturbances in the water wake of a rapidly moving boat. The shock waves generate a pressure wave that constitutes the sonic boom. On the ground a typical sonic boom from a high-flying airplane represents a series of rapid changes in air pressure lasting half a second: the pressure suddenly rises by as much as two pounds per square foot, then drops below atmospheric pressure by about the same amount and finally jumps back to normal pressure. The noise of the boom usually consists of two closely spaced, explosive reports.

The sonic-boom "wake" behind the airplane, fanning out in the shape of a cone, spans an area on the earth below that depends on the height at which the plane is flying. Typically the path of the boom on the ground is about 33 miles wide when the plane is at an altitude of three and a half miles and 50 miles wide when it is flying at a height of nine miles. The higher the plane flies, the weaker is the intensity of the boom at the ground.

The U.S. Government has conducted a number of studies of the effects of sonic booms, the most elaborate of which was a six-month test, from February to July of 1964, in the Oklahoma City area. The area was subjected to a total of 1,250 sonic booms from airplanes (during daytime hours). The average intensity of the booms in the early weeks of the test was 1.13 pounds per square foot and eventually it was raised to 1.6 pounds per square foot. Samplings of the public reaction showed that most of the people living within eight miles of the center line of a boom path were disturbed by the sonic booms. About a fourth of the people interviewed at the end of the six-month trial said that eight booms a day at the intensity of 1.6 pounds per square foot was more than they could learn to accept.

It appears that the main source of complaint was fear of damage to structures—cracks in plaster walls, weakening of the construction and so forth. More than 40 percent of the people interviewed in Oklahoma City believed their homes had been damaged by the sonic booms. Yet careful surveys of many houses showed no visible evidence of damage. In areas of the country where military airplanes regularly carry out supersonic flights, often producing strong sonic booms of more than two pounds per square foot, few damage claims have been filed by residents. On the whole the available evidence suggests that public apprehensiveness about sonic booms will be greatly reduced if people receive credible guarantees that their homes will not be damaged within specified limits of exposure and if these limits are strictly enforced. It is important, therefore, that the Federal Government prepare for the arrival of supersonic travel by establishing tolerable limits for sonic booms—limits that will not damage property or be seriously disturbing to people's peace of mind.

For man in the present "advanced" stage of civilization noise is no longer a trivial problem. It is ironic that the U.S., with its genius for creating technical marvels and solving technological problems, allows this most unpleasant affliction to debase its culture. We could improve the quality of our environment enormously by allocating a portion of our energy and wealth to controlling noise. With some ingenuity and at moderate cost we can hush our noisiest industries to save the hearing of workers. We can mitigate the roar of traffic—on the ground and in the air—by instituting and enforcing noise codes, by improving the design and operation of vehicles, interposing buffer zones to separate residential areas from airports and superhighways (through zoning and condemnation) and by sealing buildings against noise where proximity to noise is unavoidable. With a willingness to pay the extra price in construction costs we can also have quiet homes. It appears that we shall have to pay these costs if we are to make a tolerable adaptation to the noises of civilization.

[From the Aeronautical Research Institute of Sweden, Memorandum PE-19]

THE MENACE OF THE SONIC BOOM TO SOCIETY AND CIVIL AVIATION—BASED ON "THE SONIC-BOOM MENACE," PRESENTED AT THE 4TH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS FOR NOISE ABATEMENT, BADEN-BADEN, MAY 11–14, 1966

(By Bo Lundberg, Director General, FFA)

SUMMARY AND ADDITIONAL CONCLUSIONS

The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) has stated:

"The (boom) intensity must obviously not be great enough to cause any damage to property—" (Ref. 17), and

"SSTs must be able to operate without creating unacceptable situations due to sonic boom" (Ref. 31).

The International Air Transport Association (IATA) has stated:

"Economic operations (of SSTs) as supersonic speed must be practicable over inhabited areas at any time of the day or night." (Ref. 18)

There is conclusive evidence that none of the two ICAO requirements will be complied with by SSTs, currently built or designed, flying at supersonic speed over inhabited land.

Thus ICAO has already, by implication, condemned supersonic *overland* operation by SSTs (since there are no uninhabited land areas on the earth large enough to admit the 70 to 80 miles wide boom carpets sufficiently long for making supersonic flight practical). It also follows that the SST will not be able to meet the IATA requirement without violating the ICAO conditions.

Some SST proponents believe that SST operation could be profitable even if supersonic speeds are limited to the *over-water* portions of the total routes (provided that the sonic boom does not create restrictions on supersonic flight over water). This belief seems unfounded. Such operation will most likely be uneconomical in competition with the future "Jumbo Jets".

Over and above this, many people on boats will certainly oppose the disturbance and hazards especially within the vast climb portion of the carpets plus the inevitable magnification—by a factor of 2 or 2.5—within a horseshoe-shaped area at the beginning of each boom carpet.

It therefore seems at least possible—in the author's opinion probable—that severe boom restrictions will be imposed on supersonic flight also over water. This would result in such heavy economic losses that most of the SSTs would have to be scrapped.

Thus, the fact that prototypes of the Concorde are being built and that many hundred millions of dollars have already been spent on SST developments in the U.S. has put the SST investors (the supporting governments and existing and prospective SST manufacturers, and those airlines that have ordered or will order SSTs) in a most serious dilemma; they face the risk of losing all or most of the investments made up to the point of time—the "point of return"—when it has become clear to everybody that supersonic flight will not be allowed extensively enough to prevent SST operation from becoming grossly uneconomical. The losses at stake would be very large even if the SST developments were stopped right now. Much more important, however, is the fact that the losses will rapidly increase until the "point of return", and they might eventually run into several tens of thousands of millions of dollars.

In the author's opinion, the main responsibility for this menace rests with those technical people who have studied the implications of the sonic boom but either have not adequately clarified and stressed the serious implications of their findings or have presented them in an incomplete or misleading way.

This has caused the governments which decided to build SST prototypes, or to develop SST projects, to underestimate greatly the implications of the sonic boom. This may also apply both to the top advisors to the governments and to those airlines which, by first signing options on SSTs, initiated a chain reaction with most other airlines following suit for reasons of competition. There is little doubt that, if the sonic-boom problem had been explained and presented in a correct and complete way, the decisions on various phases of SST developments or options would never have been taken.

In particular, the technical people in question have failed to make clear:

(1) the unprecedentedly large variation, due to atmospheric effects and/or flight manoeuvres, in boom intensity around the "nominal" limits (of 1.5 up to 2.5 pounds per square foot for various supersonic flight conditions),

(2) the statistical implication of this variation: within a typical boom carpet over land there will be something like 10.000.000 occurrences per year where people are struck by "superbangs" exceeding 3.0 psf,

(3) the large magnifications, usually by a factor of 2 and often more, that will inevitably be created, within a confined area, by reflection of the shock wave from walls,

(4) the inevitable "horseshoe" magnification,

(5) the possibility that these magnification effects might be combined and result in teriffic "super-superbangs",

(6) that most houses all over the world contain numerous spots or areas in imperfect condition susceptible to accumulated effect of repeated average and magnified booms or to single superbangs; as a result there will be extensive and ever-increasing damage to property all over the world from SST operation over land,

(7) that the SSTs, because of their greater length compared with military supersonic aircraft, carry much greater energy for the same overpressure; this most likely will greatly outweigh the possibly alleviating effect of the wave shape of the SST booms,

(8) that the boom tests over Oklahoma City in 1964, in spite of being confined to overflights at daytime, clearly indicated that the booms will awaken most light sleepers within the whole boom carpet plus a high proportion of all sleepers in the middle of the carpet,

(9) that the boom therefore will be detrimental to the health of many people,

(10) that the justification of, and the tolerance of people to any kind of noise is highly dependent upon the necessity and real need of the activity that creates the noise, and that there is no great need for the further time gain by the SSTs because the time spent onboard near-sonic jets is already usually conveniently short and often efficiently usable for a meal or resting (this implies that the flight time is no longer a "loss" to the passenger, a misconception that seems to be a cornerstone in the motivation for the SSTs),

(11) that for these reasons—and also because of the enormous extension of the boom carpets and of the fact that practically all of those people who suffer the most by the booms can never be "acclimatized" to the sudden claps—people in general, as well as medical scientists, are certain to demand much more severe restrictions on the boom than on any other kind of man-made noise,

(12) that the supersonic flight of the SSTs most likely will be deemed illegal in many countries, not least because of the risks to life and limb that the boom will impose, and

(13) that the main reasons advocated for the SST, the gains claimed with regard to prestige, balance of payment, employment and "aeronautical leadership" for the SST manufacturing countries will not increase the acceptability of the boom in other countries. Instead the war-like thunder claps are likely to create hostile reactions, especially in underdeveloped countries.

In view of the overwhelming evidence that the general public will not willingly accept the sonic boom, it would be in the best interest of civil aviation in general and of the SST investors in particular that governments throughout the world specify in advance their condiitons for permitting supersonic overflight by SSTs over their countries. The proposal made in this paper is that the governments should declare that supersonic overflight will be prohibited *IF* the boom is capable of awaking light sleepers, by day or night. Other people—sick, nervous, and aged people, many small children—might suffer as much or more by the sudden boom claps and their subaudible energy. However, the lightsleepers form a more unambiguous category suitable for statistically significant tests, it being easy to determine whether or not people are awakened by booms of varying intensity and hence the limit that can be deemed acceptable for the people of any one country.

The knowledge today about the sonic boom is sufficient for the above conclusions. There is therefore no justification for the widespread opinion that prototypes of the SSTs must be built and flown to make it possible to determine whether or not the boom will be acceptable. This policy would have the effect of a trap: It would imply such enormous additional investments that it would be even more difficult than today to prevent the SSTs from being introduced extensively into civil aviation regardless of how severe the booms will be. It would therefore lead to gross subjection of people on the ground (in countries which have not prohibited supersonic overflight in advance) to detrimental boom effects for many years until the citizens revolt and end the activity.

The effect of the "wait-for-boom-tests-with-real-SST-policy" would, however, be even worse for the SST investors. It would therefore be in their best interest—even if "preventing of damage-to-health" conditional bans are not issued by many governments—to postpone further SST prototype developments and, above all, decisions on series production until (a) they have carried out, with existing military aircraft, extensive night boom tests (representative for people and housing all over the world), and (b) adequate boom tests (including the horseshoe effect) over water with dense sea traffic.

ADDENDUM

An official communication from the Minister of Health of West Germany, dated November 2, 1966, reads:

"The Federal German Government is of the opinion that civil supersonic flight should not be permitted over inhabited areas in Germany as long as supersonic flight creates noise disturbances that might cause damage to health. The German Government considers it necessary that the German legislature without delay duly considers the problem of supersonic flight and the noise disturbances that it causes. In the "Bundestag" the German Government has answered a question by a member of the "Bundestag" in accordance to these principles."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 8, 1966]

THE SST DECISION: BIG HURDLE LEFT—DESIGNS HAVE BEEN CHOSEN, BUT FUTURE OF PROTOTYPE IS STILL TO BE DECIDED

(By Robert A. Wright)

The decision of the Johnson Administration not to decide now on the supersonic jet transport prototype program has left a lot of experts unsure of themselves.

Thirty months of suspense over who would win the intense design competition for the 1,800-mile-an-hour jetliner ended Dec. 31 when the Federal Aviation Administration chose the design of Boeing Company over that of the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation for the airframe and the General Electric Company's engines over those of the Pratt &

Whitney aircraft division of the United Aircraft Corporation.

At that time, everybody had been led to believe, the go-ahead was to be given on the next phase of the so-called SST program, the start of construction of two prototype planes and flight testing. That did not happen.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

Just what is supposed to be happening now is not too clear.

In making its design award, the F.A.A. said the winning companies would continue development work—"refinements"—under temporary, month-long contracts. The F.A.A. has about $8-million left to spend on such work, which, it has been estimated, is enough for about two months.

But asked just how much the companies would be paid and what they would be doing under the extension contracts, a spokesman for the F.A.A. referred the questioner to the companies.

PROGRAM MARKING TIME

On the matter of money, the companies referred the question to the F.A.A. A spokesman for Boeing, which has had 1,500 employes engaged in its SST program, said refinements would include wind-tunnel testing, construction of sectional mockups, engine-inlet wind-tunnel testing and further development of components and systems. General Electric said simply that it would continue tests of its engine's various components.

The Boeing spokesman pointed out that it was not unusual to continue development work after a design has been set. "This is a continuing thing in this industry. We're still refining the 707."

That said, the nations SST program is definitely marking time.

The Government's decision to delay the prototype program is viewed by most observers as primarily tied to budgetary problems. The President has been wrestling for weeks with the fiscal 1968 budget, always a difficult task, and now made more so by the simultaneous demands of the Great Society programs and the Vietnam war effort.

Congress appropriated $200 million for prototype work in the current fiscal year, which ends June 30—money that was not needed. The F.A.A. was scheduled to request another $430 million for fiscal 1968, as part of the over-all $1 billion prototype cost estimate. Should the SST program be long postponed, it might be considered a casualty of Vietnam.

A LESS FRIENDLY CONGRESS

If the President finds a way of working the SST money into his budget, the question would still have to be settled in Congress, a new Congress, decidedly less friendly to the President.

But beyond budgetary considerations, there are other factors that may delay the big jet.

Most of these involve technical problems. There are few experts who do not concede that the SST can be built, but there are many who are convinced that further research and development work would be valuable before the program enters the next stage. Such things as the problems of fabricating titanium—while much advanced by the SST program—could still use more work, many experts believe.

Sonic boom is another problem.

A nontechnical problem, but one that may have rough sledding in Congress, involves the establishment of a system to repay the Government for underwriting the SST program. The Government is expected to expend at least 75 per cent of the estimated $4 billion to $5 billion to finance the program.

METHOD NOT CERTAIN

It has been envisioned that some sort of royalty system would be used to repay the Government, but no precise method has yet been worked out.

But despite these obstacles, the pressure of foreign competition is expected to be the overriding factor that will not permit a long postponement of the American SST.

The British-French consortium developing the Concorde supersonic transport, a plane with less capacity and speed than the United States version will have, is due to be in commercial operation by 1970 or 1971, or about three years before this nation could get an SST in service. If there were no American plane to buy, airline competition could be expected to severely aggravate the United States balance-of-payments problem as American lines bought Concordes at $21 million each.

The scope of the drain was emphasized last week when the Concorde's sales chief told a London Press conference that the consortium would be making large profits by the time the American SST was airborne. E. H. Burgess, Concorde sales manager, said the consortium expected to have at least $4.2 billion in orders by 1975.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 12, 1967]

SONIC BOOMS DAMAGE U.S. PARKS—SOUND WAVE SHOCKS DESTROY PREHISTORIC CLIFF DWELLINGS

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, January 11.—Sonic booms from military aircraft have caused damage to prehistoric cliff dwellings and geological formations in at least two national outdoor preserves, the National Park Service said today.

The park service reported to Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall on damage in cliff dwellings in Canyon de Chelly National Monument in northeastern Arizona, geological formations in Bryce Canyon National Park in Utah and potential damage in Mesa Verde National Park in Colorado. Mesa Verde is regarded as having outstanding examples of cliff dwellings.

Mr. Udall said the situation was disturbing because of the "intrusion of the sonic boom on the fragile masterpiece of nature."

He said he had taken the problem up with the Air Force, which promised cooperation but suggested that the Federal Aviation Agency should be consulted. Air space is considered to be the province of the aviation agency.

The Secretary said that he had not yet talked with agency officials, but that he intended to do so because the problem of noise and the sonic boom from jet airplanes was growing.

He also said that he intended to send the National Park Service report to a special sonic panel of the National Academy of Sciences to enlist aid to protect the public shrines administered by the Interior Department.

PROBLEM UNFORESEEN

Further, he suggested that perhaps a national policy should be considered for this aspect of the sonic problem, which had not arisen before.

"We're not attempting to tell the military how to operate," he said. "We're telling them what occurred. We should be asking ourselves whether there are alternatives that minimize intrusion and minimize damage in these prized natural areas."

George B. Hartzog Jr., director of the National Park Service, said in his report on the damage that during the summer of 1966 the number of times that high-flying jet aircraft had broken the sound barrier over Canyon de Chelly had "increased sharply."

Canyon de Chelly (pronounced SHAY-ee) and its tributary gorges are in the Navajo Indian reservation. They are situated near Chinle, about 70 miles northwest of Window Rock. Many Indians live in the canyon during the summer months, raising sheep, goats, corn and fruit. At its deepest point, the sheer walls of the canyon rise more than 1,000 feet.

"On Aug. 11, a Navajo Indian, Guy Yazzie Teller, witnessed a large portion of an overhanging cliff fall and demolish a prehistoric cliff dwelling in Canyon del Muerto," Mr. Hartzog said. "A sonic boom was heard immediately after the cliff section fell. The slide areas continued to break and slide with each additional sonic boom."

On Oct. 4, he said, Charles B. Supplee, a park Ranger described as a qualified archeologist, "observed continuing damage by sonic boom between 12:27 and 12:31 P.M. and at 2:33 P.M."

Since Aug. 11, precise records have been kept, he said, and from that date through Dec. 22 the sound barrier was broken 83 times over the national monument.

EXTENSIVE DAMAGE

"With extensive back country and side canyons," he went on, "the total damage from the cause is impossible to assess; however, it is reasonable to assume that it is extensive in view of the on-site observation in Canyon del Muerto." This canyon is a part of the national monument.

Park service engineers estimated that about 80 tons of rock fell on the cliff dwellings in Canyon del Muerto.

A sonic boom is the noise generated on the ground from a shock wave of air compressed by the flight of an airplane at or above the 660-mile-an-hour speed of sound. The wave of compressed air exerts physical pressure against whatever stands in its path. The wave varies in intensity and thus the damage varies.

A strong shock of air could seriously damage buildings, while a lesser shock would rattle windows and cause dishes or other objects to fall off shelves.

Mr. Hartzog said that the frequency of flights over Mesa Verde National Park had also increased last year. The intensity of the one sonic boom was sufficient to cause a sharp rattling of windows, doors and lighting fixtures in the Administration Building.

"There have been no known instances of direct damage to any of the Mesa Verde cliff dwellings," he said, but "such could have occurred in the remote areas of the park and be as yet undiscovered."

Many of the areas, he said, preserve significant scenic and scientific formations carved in delicate and fragile design by wind and rain over tens of thousands of years.

Since Nov. 2, he said, sonic booms have occurred 15 times in Bryce Canyon National Park. On Oct. 12, he said, 10 to 15 tons of dirt and rock were found to have fallen from one of the foundations near the bottom of the Navajo Loop Trail.

Mr. Udall was asked what the alternatives were to jet aircraft causing sonic booms. He replied that perhaps the aviation agency could consider such flights over water rather than over land.

Mr. Hartzog said that the agency had imposed ceilings for commercial and private flights over some national preserves but said these had been formulated for propeller-driven airplanes.

"The jet is a new experience," he said.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF AERONAUTICS AND ASTRONAUTICS,
New York, N.Y., January 6, 1967.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KUPFERMAN: Because of the current discussion concerning a fourth "jetport" in the Metropolitan New York area, I thought you might be interested in a few of the articles in this month's Astronautics & Aeronautics Magazine.

May I point out especially:

—Aircraft noise is treated in two separate articles. One, by Nicholas E. Golovin, Special Assistant to President Johnson for Science and Technology, describes a report recently completed by a special Jet Aircraft Noise Panel set up by the Office of Science and Technology. This article begins on page 71.

—A second article, on page 34, is entitled "Aircraft Noise—Mitigating the Nuisance." The article, by E. J. Richards, Director of the Institute of Sound and Vibration Research at the University of Southampton, describes research being done in Britain and includes invited comments from American experts.

—A report on Metro Air Support 1966, an FAA-sponsored exercise which gave Vertical and Short Take-off and Landing aircraft a major workout in Manhattan recently, is on page 30.

I hope you will find these articles useful.

Sincerely,

A. G. KILDOW.

NOTE

Because of the considerable length of these articles, the only one reproduced in the RECORD referred to by Alfred Kildow is the first by Nicholas E. Golovin.

ALLEVIATION OF AIRCRAFT NOISE—CONCERNED GOVERNMENT AGENCIES HAVE JOINED FORCES TO DEAL WITH THE INCREASINGLY COMPLEX PROBLEM OF AIRCRAFT NOISE—BEFORE IT BECOMES FAR TOO COSTLY AND DIFFICULT TO SOLVE

(By Nicholas E. Golovin, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President)

(NOTE.—Nicholas E. Golovin (AF) joined the staff of the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology in April 1962. From 1943–58 he held posts with WPB, NRL, NOTS, and NBS; was appointed Chief Scientist of WSMR in 1958; in 1959 became Director of ARPA's Technical Operations Div.; in 1960 was appointed Deputy Associate Administrator of NASA and later, in July 1961, became Director of the NASA–DOD Large Launch Vehicle Planning Group.)

During the takeoff, climb, and landing approach, large aircraft—particularly those powered by jet engines—generate great volumes of noise. Exhaust jets, compressors, and fans are the main sources of this noise. Exhaust-jet-induced noise is of primary concern during takeoff operations. Noise caused by compressors and fans has its greatest impact during landing approach.

In the last two or three years, communities near airports servicing such large cities as New York, Los Angeles, and Seattle, as well as several smaller cities, have expressed increasing annoyance about aircraft noise. The main reasons for this growing problem appear to be:

—Greater noise-generating potentials of the larger aircraft entering or expected to enter commercial service.

—The rapidly growing volume of all types of aircraft traffic at principal national airports.

—The increasing number of people exposed to noise in the general vicinity of major airports.

The more serious airport-noise problems now typically occur near a relatively small number of very large U.S. cities—but it seems probable that similar difficulties will eventually arise near airports serving less populous communities. This is very likely to happen because the shorter-range (and more noisy) jet aircraft suited to smaller airports are entering service at a rapidly rising rate; because a rapidly growing volume of air traffic is one of our most clearly defined national economic trends; and because the encroachment of housing developments on airports is likely to continue until more specific, effective real-estate controls are developed.

Aircraft noise can be viewed as environmental deterioration, falling into the same category of general social problems as air and water pollution. Such problems are characterized by formidable complexity, due largely to the multiplicity of interacting technical, economic, and social factors which must be individually isolated, understood, and measured to achieve definition of effective ameliorative steps.

Let us examine some of the factors mainly responsible for complexity of the aircraft-noise problem.

While the description and measurement of aircraft noise in physical terms is relatively straightforward, the problem of quantitatively estimating the subjective reactions of individuals and groups to noise is much more difficult. This difficulty of measuring psychological effects of noise itself contributes to the over-all complexity of the alleviation problem, mainly because quantitative standards will change with improved understanding of the phenomena and of techniques for their measurement.

Also, the fact that knowledge at any given time is inadequate to set firm standards well into the future will almost certainly be used by special-interest groups as a reason for opposing the establishment of interim standards. Yet, such interim provisions are essential.

Competition among economic interests offers numerous important benefits to every field—including commercial aviation. However, the existence of conflicting interests among various industry groups involved in aircraft noise has inhibited initiative by any one group. For example, manufacturers have found it difficult to propose engine modifications because airline operators claim they cannot afford to pay for them. Also, for economic reasons, some airline operators insist on maximizing the payload to be carried with a specific engine-airframe combination, despite resultant takeoff noise levels that prove objectionable to communities near airports. Further, some communities bordering on airports are not willing to accept the economic consequences of zoning constraints or the exercise of eminent domain. They argue that the effects of aircraft noise should be reduced by improving engines, off-loading aircraft and requiring steeper takeoff and landings; and many affected residents object to zoning changes if these will lead to their being displaced in spite of favorable economic incentives. The most obvious consequence of such conflicts is that local noise difficulties have continued growing in parallel with aviation-related investments so that the difficulties and costs of possible ameliorative actions have also become progressively greater.

The need to attack aircraft noise with a comprehensive "systems" approach is quite obvious. Far less obvious, however, is the matter of usefully defining "the system" and the main component problems. For example, while some industry associations have purported to be developing a "systems approach," the crucial step of deciding what is to be included under the term "system" has been hopelessly compromised by excluding residents of affected communities from the model.

Similarly, a systems analysis could not be useful without reasonably accurate estimates of the cost/benefit relationships for various proposed ameliorative steps. But while in many of the most important situations costs can perhaps be clearly defined, estimates of prospective benefits must be weighted by public policy considerations which will clearly vary—depending, for example, on whether the term "public" is to be applied at the national level, the state level, or the local level.

Therefore, the initial Office of Science and Technology (OST) approach to the aircraft-noise problem took the course of arranging a confrontation among the main interest groups through appropriate selection of membership in the 1965 Jet Aircaft Noise Panel. The usefulness of this confrontation was enhanced by requiring each participant to set forth his opinion in writing, for review and criticism by all others prior to the meeting of the panel.

The conclusions and recommendations of the panel represented a clear consensus of view after the participants had studied each other's papers and then carried out an intensive debate. Therefore, we can describe this effort as the first U.S. attempt at a "qualitative systems analysis" of the jet-aircraft noise problem and of possible Federal government steps toward a solution. Subsequent work by OST and the other Federal agencies associated with it in the noise-alleviation effort has continued along these lines—but perhaps with increased emphasis on issues and relationships that can be dealt with somewhat more rigorously along quantitative lines.

After issuance of the OST Report in March 1966, the President asked the Director of OST to work with the Secretaries of Commerce and Housing and Urban Development, and with the Administrators of NASA and the FAA, in developing an aircraft-noise alleviation program. An interagency program and an organization to implement it were established in response to the Presidential request. The content of the program is based on recommendations of the OST Report.

The organization consists of three Committees. The *Policy Committee* is chaired by the OST Director, with the principals mentioned above as members. The *Program Evaluation and Development Committee* (PEDC) has the OST Director as chairman, and its members or participants represent most of the major industrial and governmental interests in the program. The *Management Committee* is chaired and staffed by the FAA. Its members are designated by the Federal agencies having specific responsibilities of roles in the program.

The Policy and Management Committees have been active since May 1966. The Program Evaluation and Development Committee (PEDC) was activated early last August.

The period since the Jet Aircraft Noise Panel Report was put into final form has provided many opportunities for additional analysis of the Panel's conclusion. Some clarification has also resulted from initial attempts at implementation of the Panel's recommendations. Let us examine, in summary, the main suggestions for clearer insights and some changes in emphasis reflected by the current situation in dealing with these problems.

FAA Authority to Set Noise Limits in Aircraft Certification: The Panel concluded that Federal initiative is essential to progress in noise alleviation. Spectacular increases in jet-aircraft traffic at the largest airports during the past year have underlined this conclusion, making more obvious the need for the FAA to inhibit continuing environmental deterioration near major airports by setting an upper limit to the noise-generating capabilities of the new aircraft types it will be asked to certify in the future. Now legislation will be necessary to ensure adequate FAA authority in meeting this goal.

Interim Noise Standards: Today, more than in the past, there seems to be a general acceptance of the tentative conclusion of experts on the Panel that adequate technical knowledge and justification already exist for experimental (interim) use of quantitative standards for permissible noise levels measured on the ground from a given aircraft flying a specified course. Also, the FAA's probability of success in securing Congressional approval for authority to set limits on the noisiness of future aircraft is likely to be appreciably enhanced if its request is broadly supported by the public as well as by affected industrial and other interest groups whose aid could be of help.

To ensure such support, however, it probably will be useful to outline the nature of interim noise standards which might be initially set. And, clearly, the sooner such intentions are made available for general analysis and debate, the more likely it will be that broad public and industry support can

be assured. Other, relatively obvious advantages of early action along these lines are that it will significantly increase the motivation for aircraft and engine manufacturers to accelerate their work on reducing noisiness at the source; and that, for a given volume of traffic at an airport, the likelihood of continuing increases of noise levels in the adjacent communities should be diminished.

Vigorous Government Support of Research: The results of research during the last few years, both here and abroad, clearly suggest that community objections to aircraft noise depend not only on the perceived instantaneous noise levels of aircraft, but also on their duration and on the daily number of noise-producing flyovers. Recent PEDC discussions of some of the pertinent questions tend to confirm that the British "Noise Number Index," the German "O" number, and the American "CNR," while more-or-less independently derived, all provide about the same quantitative estimates of noise annoyance levels in communities adjacent to airports.

The question what is an "acceptable" noise level for a given community as predicted by such indices does not yet—and may never—have a generally acceptable answer. Nevertheless, it does seem true that, other things being equal, changes in the average maximum perceived noise level of individual aircraft are much more important contributors to the over-all index level than are changes in the number of daily operations. This means that even small reductions (a few PNdB) in noise produced by individual aircraft can have a very pronounced effect on community reactions to adjacent airport operations. Furthermore, because it seems inevitable that air traffic will continue growing at practically all airports, large and small, it appears to be doubly essential in the long run not only to limit the noise-generating potential of new aircraft, but also to reduce it for those current aircraft types that are likely to be used for years into the future.

The setting of interim noise standards will provide important incentives needed to reduce the noise potential of future aircraft. But it seems obvious that rapid progress here—as well as in the definition of useful modifications applicable to existing aircraft types—will require vigorous governmental participation in and support of pertinent R&D programs.

Steeper Takeoff and Landing: Arguments concerning the relatively great benefits of diminished noise levels at the source, small though these be, to airport community environment also apply to changes in operating procedures to permit higher altitudes for community over flight. There is an important difference between the two approaches, however. Modifications can be made in the engine/aircraft combination to reduce noise without changing pilot procedures or discernably compromising safety standards—whereas changes in aircraft landing and takeoff profiles appear to be much more sensitive to questions of flight safety and pilot acceptability. Thus, while presentations of recent research results along these lines to the PEDC suggest a community noise-reduction potential comparable to that of engine/airframe modifications, they imply that much work remains to be done, both to prove conclusively that the proposed procedures are compatible with current flight-safety criteria and (perhaps more difficult) to persuade airline pilots and executives that such would be the case in routine commercial operations. On the whole, which such research appears to be clearly worthwhile and should therefore be generously supported, its results may provide community-noise payoffs somewhat more slowly than success in suppression of engine-noise.

When the program recommended in OST's March 1966 Report was activated at the President's direction, a series of projects corresponding to the Panel's eight specific recommendations was established. Primarily supporting responsibilities for these projects were assigned to FAA, NASA, HUD, DOC, and USAF. The Management Committee undertook to coordinate this work on a day-to-day basis as required. The PEDC was established to evaluate progress and to develop or redirect the program as results in various projects or the national situation might indicate.

Research in noise standards, engine-noise reduction, and in takeoff and landing procedures was covered by four of Panel's eight recommendations (Numbers 4, 5, 6, and 7). The work envisaged by the Panel largely involved expanding and encouraging a sense of urgency in programs already underway in both NASA and the FAA. The most significant recent development is the prospective establishment of a major new flight-research program involving NASA's Langley Research Center and one or two major aircraft manufacturers. One of the main objectives of this program (extending probably over two years) will be to appraise the noise-reduction effectiveness of various engine-modification and installation techniques developed during the last few years by NASA in cooperation with principal U.S. jet-engine manufacturers. Also, recent test results led the FAA to report excellent future prospects for noise-improved takeoff and landing flight procedures, although the limitations that have been noted may hinder their early application.

Cost/Benefit Relationships: The OST Panel recommended the undertaking of research to develop bases for rational allocation of the costs of noise alleviation (i.e., according to the benefits received from commercial aviation). The FAA has responded by developing a program involving the participation by nongovernmental specialists in economic-factor analysis and by its own staff in related studies of the main pertinent public-policy issues. Discussions of the proposed work by the PEDC indicate that to insure their realism study results should be available for analysis and criticism on a regular basis by the PEDC and by specialists within the industries and other organizations concerned.

Improved Land Utilization: The Panel recommended establishment of a Federal Task Force representing all major Federal agencies having regulatory or financial capability to influence the course of community real-estate development near airports and military bases. The goal of this task force was to study the practicable approaches to a coordinated, federally managed and financed program for stimulating airport community development in directions likely to anticipate or ameliorate community aircraft-noise problems.

Established under the leadership of HUD, the task force has begun its work, which promises to provide far-reaching effective recommendations for action programs which will greatly help to prevent origin of new jet-aircraft-noise blighted communities.

Analysis of Critical Problem Areas: The OST Panel also recommended establishment of a high-level government task force (with appropriate staff and financial support) to undertake, on an urgent basis, an over-all "systems" type analysis of the developing jet-aircraft noise problem in the vicinity of Kennedy, O'Hare, and Los Angeles airports. The objective of this work is the formulation of practicable programs, suited to Federal sponsorship, which might greatly improve the capabilities of these communities to cope with their difficulties in jet-aircraft noise abatement and control. Furthermore, this type of systems analysis and program formulation is to be extended to the remaining 25 or so major metropolitan areas where civilian or military aircraft noise is (or promises shortly to become) a difficult community problem.

In a related recommendation, the Panel urged that the government initiate, on an urgent basis, a study projecting through 1975 available data concerning well-established trends in U.S. population, industry, commercial aviation, etc., to predict how the jet-aircraft noise problem is likely to develop about the 25 major airport areas in the U.S. On a less-urgent basis, it was also recommended that this study should be extended to encompass all U.S. airport communities expected to be using jet aircraft services by 1975. The FAA assumed primary responsibility for these two projects.

To date, progress has been slow, in part because of intrinsic technical difficulties in assuring usable results at reasonable cost. OST has recommended that "program-definition-phase" contracts to be let to one or two firms having outstanding capabilities in complex systems analysis. Results of such program definition contracts could be available by the end of 1966–67. In the next phase, these results could then be converted into additional contracts, and/or into in-house government assignments for executing the studies which the Panel initially recommended. Thus, significant interim results might be available by mid-1967.

The progress realized to date in the various program areas indicates that OST's next public report will be available about July 1, 1967.

JET AIRCRAFT NOISE PANEL

Members

Donald F. Hornig, Director, Office of Science and Technology.

Colin Mac Leod, Deputy Director, Office of Science and Technology.

Nicholas E. Golovin, Office of Science and Technology.

Oscar Bakke, Director, Eastern Region, Federal Aviation Agency.

P. K. Dygert, Univ. of California, Berkeley.

Francis T. Fox, General Manager, Los Angeles Dept. of Airports.

J. E. Frankum, Vice President, Transportation, Trans World Airlines.

W. J. Galloway, Bolt, Beranek & Newman.

Richard L. Garwin, International Business Machines.

George T. Gebhardt, Chief, Electro-Dynamics Staff, Airplane Div., The Boeing Co.

Sidney Goldstein, General Counsel, Port of New York Authority.

Harvey H. Hubbard, NASA Langley Research Center.

Frank W. Kolk, Assistant Vice President, Engineering and Development, American Airlines.

Karl D. Kryter, Stanford Research Institute.

A. L. McPike, Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.

Albert H. Odell, Aeronautical Planning Section, Port of New York Authority.

Robert L. Randall, Deputy General Counsel, Federal Aviation Agency.

Charles H. Ruby, President, Air Line Pilots Association.

Robert W. Rummel, Vice President, Planning & Research, Trans World Airlines.

James E. Strunck, Assistant Corporation Counsel, City of Chicago.

Spiridon Suciu, Large Jet Div., General Electric Co.

John M. Tyler, Project Engineer, Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Co.

H. Von Gierke, Chief, Biodynamics and Bionics Div., Aerospace Medical Research Laboratories, United States Air Force.

James F. Woodall, Aircraft Development Service, Federal Aviation Agency.

Consultants

William S. Aiken, Jr., Office of Advanced Research and Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Lyman M. Tondel Jr., Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton.

Paul M. Zimmerman, National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council.

BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT,
San Francisco, Calif., November 21, 1966.
Representative THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KUPFERMAN: I noted with keen interest in the recent issue of the Engineer newspaper your article relating to the need for increased technology in the area of noise effect on our urban areas.

In view of your interest in this area, I am pleased to forward you a copy of a recent report that we have received concerning the evaluation of noise studies that we are undertaking at the District's Test Track and also a copy of a recent speech by one of the key officials associated with our project with responsibility in this area.

If we can provide you with any additional information, we will be most pleased to forward this to you, and I also extend you a cordial invitation, at your convenience, to visit the Test Track and learn first-hand of the work being done in the area of noise and also vibration suppression.

Sincerely yours,

EDMUND C. SAJOR,
Assistant to the General Manager.

A PROGRESS REPORT ON "NOISE ABATEMENT" BY STANLEY D. FORSYTHE, TRANSIT ADVISER TO THE GENERAL MANAGER, BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT, BEFORE THE RAIL TRANSIT GROUP, AMERICAN TRANSIT ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING

Today, as cities grow and throb and people move and live in closer proximity to each other, the matter of noise (or its desirable antithesis, quietude) is being given ever-increasing attention in many segments of our urban living, working and traveling experiences. We see more and more paid advertising devoted to this subject. For instance, one of the leading automobile manufacturers in the country is featuring quietude in a good deal of their sales promotion activities. A number of airlines are emphasizing quietude in many paid advertisements and TV commercials. The Northeast Airline recently started operating a new series of equipment which they labeled the "whisper jets." These are but a few illustrations.

Rapid transit lines, both elevated and subways, have been traditionally labeled in both prose and song as prime offenders in the matter of quietude. It is recognized that the general state of the rapid transit industry does not justify great expenditures, particularly among the older rapid transit systems, to improve this situation so the necessity of determining where the money can be most effectively spent to produce the greatest amount of noise abatement becomes of paramount importance.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit District, as a brand-new addition to the rapid transit operations of the Continent, has the opportunity and, in a sense, the obligation both to the people of the San Francisco area and the industry as a whole, to make significant strides in the direction of a quieter system . . . quieter for both the riders and for those who live along the rapid transit routes.

With this goal in mind, a very comprehensive program was laid out and the most competent engineering and research people in the area were engaged to assist in the program. To date BART has spent directly in the neighborhood of a quarter of a million dollars in testing, investigating, manufacturing, and analyzing different phases of the problem. Indirectly, BART and interested manufacturers have spent at least another quarter of a million.

We learned early that there was no one simple answer. We relearned some of the basic concepts of noise abatement. We learned there were three areas interrelated to each other: (1) the generation of sound; (2) the transmission of sound; (3) the amplification of sound. The three must be considered jointly in connection with the overall problem.

A diamond point riding on a record generates little sound but it can be readily amplified beyond the limits of human tolerance.

The noises of the average automobile that are hardly noticed on an open highway can become most objectionable as that automobile goes through a tunnel. The Waldo Grade tunnel, the Pennsylvania Turnpike tunnels, the Hudson River tunnels are prime examples of this phenomena as the generated noises reverberate within the tunnel.

A clapper hitting the edge of a bell sends out vibrations of varying wave lengths (depending upon the size of the bell) which are transmitted through the atmosphere.

The noise of a steel wheel rolling on a steel rail will be transmitted through the rail and picked up by the human ear held close to the rail long before the sound transmitted through the atmosphere can be detected.

In snow country, with several inches of freshly-fallen snow on the ground, the same rapid transit train, *generating* the same amount of noise at all points on a trip, will record a wide range of sound readings as it goes through a subway, rides on an elevated structure, or glides along a snow-covered track at grade.

Finally, the average rapid transit train operating on ties and ballast set on the earth or, for that matter, a PCC car on Market Street, produces a quite satisfactory sound reading.

We have all observed and understand most of these phenomena and feel that they illustrate some of the aspects and possible answers to our problem.

What, then, is the problem? The problem is threefold: (1) to minimize the generation of noise (hit the bell with a felt hammer); (2) to minimize the amplification of noise (see that the bell is not in a reverberation chamber); (3) to minimize the transmission of noise (hold your hand on the rim of the bell).

Now that we have quieted the bell, let's tackle the rapid transit system. Let's give management an indication of where money spent in this area of noise abatement will do the most good. We might even each one of us sit briefly in management's chair and make our own decision as to how much we are willing to spend for noise abatement. First of all, do we know or can we tell management how much we could enlarge our market by taking effective steps in this direction or can we tell management how much we can improve our "image" by taking effective steps in this direction? Do we consider the matter of noise abatement of sufficient importance to recommend reasonably good-sized expenditures to improve the situation. Will it increase the riding, update the systems, improve community acceptance?

In the Summer of 1963, as they outlined a noise abatement program, BART and the Joint Venture engineers established that there were at least 10 areas where the extent of noise reduction and the corresponding cost should be studied. This general outline with some additions and subdivisions has been the basis of the work in this field during the last three years. While the work has been pursued with as reasonable diligence as could be expected without interfering with tests efforts in more critical areas, the conclusions reached have far from exhausted the studies in this field. They have, in fact, simply indicated in general terms which of these areas could be most profitably given further study. The 10 areas which are generally familiar to most rapid transit operators are as follows:

1) Insulated body shell
2) Fixed windows
3) Acoustical wheel design
4) Low-noise brake system
5) Resilient chassis and equipment mountings
6) Deep side-skirts
7) Acoustic treatment of roadbed between rails
8) Resilient track mountings
9) Continuous welded rails
10) Trackside sound barriers

An added study area might be entitled "acoustical treatment of subway walls."

Now let me report to you briefly on our progress and our tentative conclusions in each of these 10 areas. Generally speaking, the job of providing a satisfactorily quiet atmosphere within the car is not too difficult. Certainly it is a simpler job than providing a quiet exterior. If, like the airlines, we could talk only of interior quietude and disregard noises along the route, the job would be simpler, but this, of course, is only part of the job.

The first two areas—(1) insulating the body shell and (2) using fixed windows—are so generally practiced that they need little further comment. In addition to this, we propose to use carpeted floors and pay careful attention to the door seals. We also expect to get some noise abatement benefits from the use of rubber diaphragms between the end doors of the cars designed much after the fashion of the diaphragms so popular in European railroad operation. In connection with fixed windows, our sound consultants recommend exploring the benefits of double-glazed sash. This we hope to be able to do.

Item 3—acoustical wheel design. The aluminum wheel with the steel rim showed little in the way of sound mitigation when tested in Chicago. The Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton wheels were just installed a couple of weeks ago on one of the laboratory cars and have not yet been tested but look promising. The Swedish wheels, also recently installed, have not been tested for sound reduction. They also look promising. However, the Goodrich Company applied their deadbeat material to the rim of wheels on one truck and demonstrated some very promising results. This application needs further testing and evaluation but the indications were quite promising. We plan to pursue this further.

Item 4—low-noise brake system. Little has been done here in the sound mitigation field, largely because other problems in connection with the braking system must be satisfactorily resolved first.

Item 5—resilient chassis and equipment mountings. Much has been done in this area through the use of resilient journal mountings, air springs, and disc brakes, to name three important contributions. More, however, can be done in the area of gearing, gear housing and motor noises. The wheels on the trucks, regardless of their design, must have a good ground finish on the contact area. Here, also, it is my personal opinion, so far unproven, that the cylindrical tread represents an improvement in the area of sound mitigation over the taper tread simply because there are fewer flange-rail contacts.

Item 6—deep side-skirts. Acoustically designed fiber glass skirts, as deep and as continuous as possible, from end to end of the car appear to offer a significant contribution. They are universally used in one form or another for both sound mitigation and appearance by automobile, bus and even the streetcar designers of 20 years or more ago. However, we have had no opportunity as yet to evaluate skirts. Here, as in other areas, more critical system design work has precluded much evaluation of their effectiveness. The earlier experience with TCC cars, however, suggests that they can be very effective, and we hope to do much more in this area.

Item 7—acoustic treatment of roadbed between rails. Preliminary testing in this area proved disappointing. Early indications were that porous concrete or one-half inch cover-

ing of fiber glass over the concrete aerial structure surface was about as effective as loose ballast. We do not plan to follow up this work any further.

Item 8—resilient track fastenings. We are very pleased with the results that we have obtained in this area. A properly designed resilient track fastening appears to offer a reduction very worthwhile. This reduction applies to aerial structure design and is effective in reducing the transmission of noise to the structure itself. We received early indications from our sound consultant that resilient track fastenings could provide substantial noise abatement results, but the first efforts were not mechanically acceptable. More recently, General Tire, Goodrich and Pandrol have not only verified these early indications but have produced rail fastening designs that havt passed severe accelerated life tests in the AAR Laboratory in Chicago. We propose to use a fastener of this type on the aerial structures and in the tubes where the noise abatement problem is most severe. Ballasted tracks on earth present no problem if the cars themselves are well designed.

Item 9—continuous welded rail. We find continuous welded rail very effective in noise abatement but we have learned that the grinding tolerance at welded joints needs to be carefully specified. We cannot accept *any* amount of undergrinding. In a number of instances on the Test Track where the joints were slightly underground, the rail-wheel noise at these locations was as noticeable as it was at a bolted joint. Also, in the matter of continuous welded rail, we plan to grind the entire surface of the rail after laying and prior to the start of actual operation. This practice is being gradually adopted by many of the more progressive mainline railways. We have sponsored the development of a comparatively inexpensive mobile, belt-type rail grinder that we expect to operate at speeds of about 3 m.p.h. This will keep the cost of grinding the rails within reasonable limits. We also developed a companion belt-type wheel grinder where, by varying the fineness of the belt, we can obtain a highly-polished wheel surface. By paying careful attention to these two surfaces, we expect to very substantially minimize the generation of noise at the point of contact between wheel and rail.

Item 10—trackside sound barriers. Parapet sound barriers, properly designed, work very well. Preliminary tests indicate a very worthwhile reduction in trackside noise in the neighborhood of 10 decibels. Here, again, time and the pressure of more urgent work prevented a fuller evaluation. We do know, however, that they must be properly designed. The three-phase experimental power shields used on the Test Track, for example, did not prove at all effective as sound barriers. We want to study further the noise abatement possibilities of trackside sound barriers.

This is about where we stand at the present time. There is much more to be done and we sincerely hope that it can be done in the immediate future, either as a BART project or possibly as an industry project. We have gone far enough to satisfy ourselves that there are opportunities for substantial improvements in this area—improvements in all three of the areas referred to earlier. We can substantially reduce the generation of noise, we can substantially reduce the amplification of noise; and we can substantially reduce the transmission of noise.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
October 31, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have followed your interest in providing a comprehensive program for the control of noise and believe you may be assisted by a substantiating point of view not previously referred to in your writings.

Enclosed is a report of an investigation which indicates that noise levels considered "safe" for avoiding hearing damage if maintained will provide other profitable benefits. The study indicated that "unsafe" noises (with respect to the ear) seem closely related to human performance errors which are likely to result in accidents. The consequent prevention of traumatic injury or other accidental damage in work places, automobile driving and similar situations might be an additional persuasive argument for noise control.

Cordially,

JOHN V. GRIMALDI, Ph. D.,
Consultant-Health, Safety and Plant Protection.

[From Noise and Safe Work Performance]

SENSORI-MOTOR PERFORMANCE UNDER VARYING NOISE CONDITIONS

(NOTE.—Reprint of the study "Sensori-Motor Performance Under Varying Noise Conditions" by John V. Grimaldi, Ph. D., General Electric Co. This was made possible by the American Museum of Safety, through its Arthur Williams Memorial Fellowship Fund and originally appeared in *Ergonomics*, Vol. 2, No. 1, November, 1958. It is reprinted through the courtesy of the publishers of that journal.)

(By John V. Grimaldi, Ph. D., General Electric Co., New York City)

A group of subjects performed a task in quiet and noisy environments. The noise was intermittent, within the frequency range of 75 to 9600 cycles and at sound levels of 70, 80, 90, and 100 db. The sudy was experimental, but simulated an occupational situation.

There was a tendency for more errors and less precision when working in the noisy environment. Response times were slower and the number of errors greater than when noise levels and frequencies were highest. The frequency range of 2400–4800 cycles was associated with the slowest response time and largest number of errors, both at 90 and 100 db.

It appears that intermittent noise may have a reducing effect on the individual's capacity for quick and precise execution of coordinated movements. The implications for safety and certain production tasks seem obvious.

When considering the effect of noise on people, its possible hazardous influences have major significance. There is ample clinical and experimental evidence that excessive sound pressures can injure the ear or induce an accident when an alarm or warning signal is masked by a louder sound. Noise may also have another bearing on safety: the question occurs, "Can noise affect safe performance?" The extent of this possibility is a function of the closeness of the relationship between noise and mental and motor activity—as well as the implications such a relationship may have performing tasks safely.

A number of investigations have been reported on this relationship, but most have been concerned with steady-state noise. In a large number of environmental situations noises are neither steady nor expected. Intermittent noises, therefore, would appear to be of significant interest. Also, earlier investigators generally have not chosen to consider the frequency of the sound pressure waves as well as their intensity, and the relation of these factors to behavior. The purpose of this experiment was to probe these relationships.

1. METHOD

Since environmental conditions other than noise might have an influence on performance, and because many previous studies may be criticized for their lack of controls, it was decided to limit the investigation to the following conditions:

(1) Relative humidity—between 30 per cent and 70 per cent.

(2) Temperature maintained at approximately 70° F. A relationship between temperature and accident rate has been reported, indicating that in the case of factory workers, when the temperature is above 75° or below 65° F. the accident rate rises (Osborn and Vernon 1922).

(3) Illumination—artificial, unvarying for each subject and meeting the American Standard Practice for Industrial Lighting Requirements for fine bench and machine work.

(4) Time—between the hours of 9.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m., the normal work period.

(5) Subjects—chosen according to the following requirements:

(*a*) Age—18 to 35 years, the approximate age group possessing the shortest reaction time (Bellis 1933).

(*b*) Hearing—normal as determined by audiometric measurement according to the standards of the American Medical Association (Council on Physical Medicine 1945).

(*c*) Vision—near vision acuity of 14/14 to 14/21 for each eye, as determined by the Snellen Chart, considered essential for precision work (Bridges 1946).

(*d*) Food—no subject was chosen if he had over-indulged in eating within the past three hours. The digestive organs, when taxed require an extra supply of blood which may be drawn from other less active organs (Kimber and Stackpole 1936). This is suspected as the cause of the "loggy" feeling following the eating of a heavy meal. Within three hours, however, the stomach can be expected to be emptied and this condition relieved (Crandall 1935).

(*e*) Alcohol—no subject was allowed to take alcohol within at least three hours prior to participating in the experiment. It has been shown that alcohol in even small amounts impairs hand-eye coordination (Tufts College, 1951).

(*f*) Fatigue, debilitation etc.—no subject was chosen if he stated, when asked, that he felt in any way "under par" and so not up to his usual physical and mental capacities.

(*g*) Sleep—although the normal sleep ration leaves a large safety factor over and above actual needs, so that a moderate reduction in hours of sleep has no apparent effect (Anon. 1951), some indications have been obtained that deterioration in performance may occur (Husband 1935). It was considered advisable, therefore, to select only subjects who stated they had their regular amount of sleep for the past 48 hours.

Such factors as learning, experience, capacity and status were controlled by the preliminary testing and retesting of each subject until a plateau for his scores was achieved.

Noise reproduction

The noise source was a battery of series connected audio-oscillators, each consisting of a resistance-tuned oscillator in combination with an output meter and attenuator. By proper notation of the instruments and meter settings each of the sounds could be duplicated as desired. Narrow band (not pure tone) noises were chosen in the octave bands 75–150, 150–300, 300–600, 600–1200, 1200–2400, 2400–4880, 4800–9600 cycles per second. Each noise was expressed at 70, 80, 90 and 100 db.*

The noises were recorded on magnetic tape, using a recorder which was laboratory checked and found to have characteristics satisfactory for the purposes of the study.

It was considered undesirable to have a consistently orderly progression of noises of either increasing or decreasing frequency or intensity. Also it was believed that a single exposure to each noise would not give as re-

---

* Here and throughout his report the decibel (db) referred to is 0.0002 microbar.

liable results as would a random repetition of the noises.

The random presentation was complicated by the number of individual noises to be used—a total of 28—and the possibility of fatiguing the subjects since it was intended that they be tested both in noise and also in quiet to obtain comparative results. It was decided, therefore, to run the experiment so that each subject would perform in noise for no more than 30 minutes and in quiet for the same period. A three-minute interruption, midway between each period, was provided as a rest spell.

Each noise was recorded three times for periods ranging from 10 to 23 seconds. The sum of the three periods equalled 45 seconds in each case. Intermittency was accomplished in the recording by inserting brief (2 to 13 seconds) intervals of quiet between each variety of noise.

The recording began with the spoken word "Go!" This was the starting signal for which each subject was instructed to be alert. The tape was then blank (quiet) for 10 seconds after which the first noise was presented. The recording of the random presentation of noise and quiet intervals proceeded until 777 seconds (12.95 minutes) had elapsed. Then the following sentence was recorded, "Stop now and rest until instructed further". Quiet followed for 165 seconds and then the recorded announcement, "Get ready to start again in 10 seconds; 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, Go!" The word "Go" occurred 180 seconds after the rest spell began. The recording of the noises continued for another 773 seconds. The total time of the recording was 1730 seconds (28.83 minutes).

The experimental task and its equipment

The experimental task employed an adaptation of a compound slide rest, comparable to the type found on engine lathes. The apparatus consisted of a stylus mounted over a platform in which was embedded an electrically conductive, irregularly shaped pattern resembling a "key-hole" in outline. The pattern was set flush with the top surface of the platform. The stylus was mounted so that it could be moved in any desired horizontal direction by turning two handles, at right angles to each other, operating two screws which drove the stylus. The arm to which the stylus was attached was extended to accommodate a ball-point pen attachment, arranged so that a simultaneous record was made on paper of the path traced by the stylus. The conductive pattern was wired for connections with electrical recording devices.

Subjects were required to guide the stylus continuously around the pattern, using the handle controls, completing as many turns as they could within the time allowed. Breaking the contact between the stylus and the pattern interrupted the electrical circuit and actuated a system of electrical relays which in turn operated a timer, counter and permanent marking recorder. The break of contact also extinguished a flashlight-type lamp bulb, indicating incorrect operation. Thus a definite visual signal was presented, in addition to the subject's witnessing his error when allowing the stylus to deviate from the pattern.

When an error occurred, the subject was required to return the stylus to the pattern as rapidly as possible. This requirement of concentration, prompt detection and swift correction of an error may be considered typical of certain psycho-physical demands for accident prevention and efficient machine operation.

The apparatus was mounted on bench legs, approximating the height of the compound slide rest on an engine lathe. The subject was provided with a shop-type stool so that he could either stand or sit during the performance of the task.

The room in which the tests were conducted was on the 12th floor of a steel and concrete office building and possessed relatively low resonant properties; the ceiling had been treated with acoustic tile; the floor was completely carpeted and approximately 10 per cent of the wall surface was covered with heavy drapery material. The overall noise level in the room was 37 db which was created mostly by the passage of air through the ventilator grills employed in the air conditioning system; this was the quiet condition for the study.

Collecting the data

The following data were taken:

(1) *Errors* (deviations from the pattern). A monitoring recorder which marked an electro-sensitive paper tape as the circuit was interrupted, was used to tabulate the errors. The instrument was capable of recording electrical impulses having a duration in the order of microseconds.

(2) *Response time* (the amount of time elapsing between the instant when the sylus broke contact with the pattern and its return). These data were taken from the paper tape which also showed the number of errors. The tape was wound continuously on a spool driven by a synchronous motor whose RPM was known. It was possible, therefore, to determine the response time by measuring the length of the marks on the tape.

(3) *Production* (the number of turns of the stylus around the pattern). The perimeter of the pattern was spaced into 100 equal divisions. This permitted a relatively accurate determination of the fractions of turns negotiated by the stylus at the end of each period of performance.

Conducting the experiment

Some subjects were engineers and workers experienced in operating a compound slide rest as a production tool, but the majority were clerical employees; there were twice as many women as men. To ensure, as far as possible, that they consistently tried their best, a schedule of cash awards was announced as follows: For best score, $25.00; second and third best, $10.00 each; fourth and fifth, $5.00 each. All other participants received $1.00. It was recognized that providing a monetary incentive might mean that subjects worked only because of an interest in the money. This was considered to be of little significance, however, in comparison to the desirability of providing a realistic motive. The scores of the participants, when determining the five top awards, were computed by averaging the data obtained for each subject during the "quiet" and "noise" phases of the experiment, then substituting the averages in a formula taking account of all three measures and of an overall "precision rating" made by two assessors using a prepared scale in terms of which they judged the recorded tracks made during the experiment.

Each participant, before beginning the experiment, was asked to read a written set of instructions and was then permitted to perform the task for a 10-minute practice period. It was recognized that learning, through practice, would affect the results. Each participant was therefore given a series of 10-minute tests under "quiet" conditions and the performance data were collected for each. Between each test and the next the subject was permitted to rest for five minutes. When three successive tests produced data varying within ±5 per cent for each measure it was considered that the participant had reached a "plateau of learning." He was then allowed 10 minutes rest before performing the experimental task.

He began the experimental task with either the quiet or the noise conditions for the first half of the test. After a 10-minute rest he repeated the test, but this time was exposed to noise if he had started with quiet or quiet if he had started in noise. Alternate subjects started under noise and quiet conditions. Thus a check was possible later for determining whether any variation occurred, such as would be attributable to fatigue or learning through practice.

It was necessary to reject many subjects following their completion of the experiment, when it was learned that mechanical interruptions in the experimental equipment or other uncontrolled disturbing factors had occurred. As a consequence, the sample group consisted of 30 subjects who started with noise and 22 who started with quiet.

2. RESULTS

Measures for the experiment as a whole

These are set out in Table 1, from which it can be seen that, on average, performance was poorer in the noisy conditions than in the quiet in terms of each of the three measures. The difference in number of errors was small and not significant, but the differences in response time and productivity were substantial. Scores for the individual subjects are set out in the Appendix. Taking errors and productivity together, it was found that 61 per cent of the subjects made more *errors per "turn"* in noisy than in quiet conditions.

TABLE 1.—*Overall differences per subject of performance between quiet and noisy conditions*

	Errors		Total response times (in minutes)		Productivity scores	
	Quiet	Noise	Quiet	Noise	Quiet	Noise
Mean	207	227	1.95	2.59	22.89	21.85
Median	178	213	1.27	1.87	22.08	22.02
Standard deviation	159	159	1.95	2.24	9.46	9.10
Mean difference	20		0.64		1.04	
Standard error of mean difference	7.15		0.28		1.26	
t	2.8		2.54		1.41	
$P<$	0.01		0.02		0.5	
Rank correlation coefficient between individual scores in noise and quiet	0.95		0.55		0.84	

The rank-order correlations between the scores of individual subjects in noise and quiet were high for errors and productivity, but lower for response times. Presumably the noise affected the response times of some subjects relatively more than others.

Neither group showed in any of the scores a change between the first and second halves of the experiment sufficient to reverse its position with respect to the other group. This indicates that fatigue and learning as between the two halves either did not affect the results to any substantial extent, or, if they did, their affects cancelled each other.

Relation of response time and errors to sound level and frequency range

The average response times and average numbers of errors were found for each of the experiment's 28 varieties of noise conditions and were then compared with the overall means for all noise conditions taken together. The averages of the varieties which exceeded these overall means are set out in Table 2.

TABLE 2.—*Response time and error averages for noise variations exceeding the means for response time and error of the experiment as a whole*

Frequency (cycles per second)	Sound level (decibels)	Average response time	Confidence interval ($P=0.05$, $t=2.01$)	Average total errors	Confidence interval ($P=0.05$, $t=2.01$)
4,800 to 9,600	100	0·0980	0·00712	9·00	1·743
2,400 to 4,800	100	0·1027	0·00756	9·17	1·772
600 to 1,200	100	0·0915	0·00710	8·13	1·585
150 to 300	100	0·0942	0·00736	8·25	1·637
75 to 150	100	0·0951	0·00742		
4,800 to 9,600	90	0·0954	0·00721	8·61	1·698
2,400 to 4,800	90	0·1005	0·00747	8·83	1·648
1,200 to 2,400	90			8·13	1·623
75 to 150	90	0·0932	0·00742		
4,800 to 9,600	80			8·06	1·700
2,400 to 4,800	80	0·0938	0·00776		
1,200 to 2,400	80	0·0941	0·00743	8·13	1·640
4,800 to 9,600	70	0·0935	0·00763	8·08	1·669
2,400 to 4,800	70	0·0929	0·00743		
600 to 1,200	70	0·0926	0·00736		
300 to 600	70	0·0914	0·00657		

The data indicate that the response times tended to be slower and the number of errors greater when the noise levels and frequencies were highest; the response time and error averages tended to be largest for noises having sound pressure levels at 90 and 100 db; the frequency range of 2400–4800 cycles per second was associated with the slowest response time and largest number of errors at both the 100 and 90 db levels.

3. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Certain of the present results compare with the findings of previous investigators. Cassel and Dallenbach (1918) found that intermittent sounds are distracting and slow up reaction time. Miles (1953) observed that time scores for "visual reaction time" were about 5 per cent longer in the presence of noise in a series of trials which ordinarily might have been expected to result in reduced scores due to additional practice. In a subsequent test, however, Miles noted an inconclusiveness in his results and states, ". . . the results for the effect of intense noise on such simple behaviour as reaction time will vary widely according to individual differences" (p. 90). The tantalizing elusiveness of a concrete determination which will significantly express the presence or absence of a relationship between noise and reaction time is further indicated in the work of Stevens and his associates (Stevens 1941, Stevens *et al.* 1941) who found that in one instance reactions were slower in the presence of noise. However, a critical evaluation (Waring 1946), of the results of that study concluded that the noise under investigation (airplane noise) had no, or at worst a slight, detrimental effect upon motor coordination and reaction time. From the evidence submitted by the present study and others, it may be postulated that noise may lengthen reaction time, but its effect is uncertain.

The tendency indicated by the present study for lower error scores to occur during the quiet spell, may be discerned also in the results of other studies (Laird 1933, Miles 1953, pp. 87, 91).

A number of inferences concerning safety may be found in these results and in those of related studies some of whose conclusions seem to be substantiated by this investigation. For example, statistically it was clear that in the presence of the noises sampled, there was a significant increase in the average response time, number of errors committed and the number of errors per unit of production. Thus, it appears that intermittent noise may be considered to have a reducing effect on the individual's capacity for quick and precise execution of coordinated movements. The implications for safety seem obvious.

The tendency for response times to be slower and the number of errors to be greater when the noise levels and frequencies were the higest is noteworthy, particularly since this is an extension of an earlier report (Broadbent 1957). It appears that 90 db, especially for the higher frequencies, is a limit beyond which noise is likely to impair performance. It is curious that this approximates also the limiting noise levels for controlling interference with speech and risk of damage to hearing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study was made possible by the American Museum of Safety, through its Arthur Williams Memorial Fellowship Fund which has participated frequently in the development of basic safety information.

REFERENCES

BELLIS, C. J., 1933, Reaction Time and Chronological Age. *Proc. Soc. exper. Biol. Med.*, 30, 801–803.

BRIDGES, C. D., 1946, *Job Placement of the Physically Handicapped*. New York: McGraw-Hill, p. 46.

BROADBENT, D. A., 1957, Effects of Noises of High and Low Frequency on Behaviour. *Ergonomics*, 1, 21–29.

CASSEL, E. E., and DALLENBACH, K. M., 1918, The Effect of Auditory Distraction Upon the Sensory Reaction. *Am. J. Psychol.*, 29, 129–143.

COUNCIL ON PHYSICAL MEDICINE, 1945: Minimum Requirements for Acceptable Audiometers. *J. Am. Med. Ass.*, 127, 520.

CRANDALL, L. A., 1935, *An Introduction to Human Physiology*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., p. 151.

HUSBAND, R. W., 1935, The Comparative Value of Continuous vs. Interrupted Sleep. *J. Exper. Psychol.*, 18, 792–796.

KIMBER, D. C., and STACKPOLE, C. E., 1936, *Textbook of Anatomy and Physiology*, New York: MacMillan, p. 305.

LAIRD, D. A., 1933, The Influence of Noise on Production and Fatigue as Related to Pitch, Sensation, Level and Steadiness of Noise. *J. appl. Psychol.*, 17, 320–330.

MILES, W. R., 1953, Immediate Psychological Effects, Benox Report: *An Exploratory Study of the Biological Effects of Noise*, ONR Project NR 144079, Chicago: Chicago University, p. 81–95.

OSBORNE, E. G., and VERNON, H. M., 1922, Contributions to the Study of Accident Causation. *Industrial Fatigue Research Board Report No.* 19. London: H.M.S.O.

STEVENS, S. S., 1941, The Effects of Noise and Vibration on Psycho-Motor Efficiency, Harvard University, OSRD Report No. 32.

STEVENS, S. S., *et al.*, 1941, Part I. The Effects of Noise on Psycho-Motor Efficiency. Part II. Noise Reduction in Aircraft as related to Communications, Annoyance and Aural Injury, Harvard University, *OSRD Report No.* 274.

TUFTS COLLEGE, Institute for Applied Experimental Psychology, 1951, *Handbook of Human Engineering Data*, Part VII, Chapter II, Section IIIc, p. 4.

WARING, C. E., ed., 1946, Transmission and Reception of Sounds Under Combat Conditions, Washington, D.C.: Office of Scientific Research and Development, *TIPVII* 30.

ZHIVKO D. ANGELUSCHEFF, M.D.,
New York, N.Y. October 16, 1966.

THEODORE KUPFERMAN,
Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: I have sent you an article (in foreign language) with new data concerning the *noise*.

Realizing that your staff of translators are not so versed in medical terminology, I did translate the said article in English.

"Our failure to treat Progressive Deafness."

There is information on effects of prolonged speedy flying on the organism: both dogs in cosmos! pilots kept in cabin in atmosphere of Helium & Oxygen, change their *bass* voice into *tenor!*

Enclosed you'll find a copy of a letter of support of the *Antinoise Movement* from a prominent scientist, the President of the International E.N.T.-Association, Prof. Jo Ono, member of the Regent Office of Japan.

Wishing you success in your endeavor for your *great cause*, gaining on support everywhere,

I am most sincerely yours,
ZHIVKO D. ANGELUSCHEFF.

OUR FAILURE TO TREAT PROGRESSIVE DEAFNESS

(By Zhivko D. Angelusheff, M.D., member of the Academy of Medicine, N.Y.)

We live in an atom age. The dangers of radiation are known to all of us. It's being studied and effective measures are being taken against it. The radioactivity of the air and water are being chemically analyzed. The grass on which animals feed is being checked up. The percentage of strontium in milk and meat is carefully studied because meat and milk are parts of our food. The health of children, who live in areas unfavorable for the radiation conditions, is being compared with the state of health of children who live far from the possible centers of radiation. A whole army of scientists works to defend humanity from the atom. This danger is faced now with a strong and secure line of defense.

But humanity is confronted with another terrible enemy. About him we cannot even say that it creeps up noiselessly. This enemy declares with much noise, with too much noise in fact, about its presence. We all are subject to its action. This enemy systematically and relentlessly saps humanity's health. However, no measures or almost no measures are taken to defend ourselves against this enemy. It is only a few people who are fully aware of the dimensions of this danger and who raise their voice, trying to attract the attention of those in power, and doing it so far in vain and without any tangible results.

In October, 1965 in Tokyo the Eighth International Congress of the Ear and Throat Specialists took place. After this Congress I found myself in Yugoslavia, and the radio Belgrade asked me the following question:

Doctor, you were present at the Congress and read a paper before it. Will you kindly acquaint us with the problems which were discussed at this Congress? What was, in your opinion, the most important problem as far as the contemporaries were concerned?

There were many important questions on the agenda of the Congress. More than 7000 people attended it representing sixty different countries. It is of course, impossible to touch upon everything. I shall discuss one of the most vital problems of all—the progressively increasing deafness of the people, or otosclerosis, and our failure to cure mankind from it.

Otosclerosis is a sound, or sonic disease. The basic cause of this illness is the vibra-

tional energy with which our mechanized civilization has so generously endowed us with. On our scientific screen we see only the consequences—the progressively increasing *deafness* and the progressively increasing *mental diseases*. This is indeed a very odd and a very mysterious "progress", and isn't it about time to think where it can lead us to?

The sound is heard when it is perceived by the human ear. But when the source of the sounds are vibrations of high order, the supersonic ones, man does not hear them. Nature gave man a hearing apparatus which can detect from 16 to 32,000 vibrations a second. Sounds beyond this limit man does not hear, that is, they cannot be perceived by human ear. A dog hears up to 50,000 vibrations a second: a bat perceives up to 120,000 vibrations. These sounds are beyond human hearing, but objectively they do exist.

Before the mechanization of human life the supersonic energy was in the hands of the gods. When lightning flashed and thunder boomed, the mortals on earth whispered fearfully to each other: The gods on the Olympus are drunk; they are angry; they are quarelling". In our days man has assumed the prerogatives of the gods.

For the first time in history from over the sky over Oklahoma descended on a city the power of the supersonic jets created by man. As an official delegate to the International Association Against Noise (A.I.C.B.: Association Internationale Contre Bruit in Switzerland), I was a witness to the fact how men were executing their brethren during six long months. Eight times a day the jets flew over the city at the height of 35 thousand feet. With their thunder, the sonic boom, they were executing all the living on earth. The only ones who remained were birds in cages and people chained down by their work.

This is what the owner of a chicken farm told me. "Before the appearance of the jets, my chickens were healthy and gay and all day long they were peeping. It was a sheer pleasure to work among them. After the sound thunder, the sonic boom, of the first flights they became very nervous: they dashed around their cages as if they were blind and would smash themselves against the nets. A few days later they started to shed their feathers. Subsequently, I could say they were losing their mind, they were losing their appetite, stopped eating, reached a state of complete exhaustion and finally perished. The hens would turn morose; stopped laying their eggs; began to suffer from internal hemorrhages and finally died.

"Now I am asking myself the question: couldn't the authorities by laboratory tests establish what harm the sonic boom would cause to the animal world? They should have established this and then forewarned us of what lay in store for us. My chicken farm which counted 10,000 chickens before the flights, within six months was reduced to 4,000 because of the sonic boom! Why didn't the authorities think about it? I would like very much indeed to have an answer to this my question."

Man, as has been established, can stand the noise of the intensity of 70 decibels. This is the utmost limit. The supersonic jet flying over 70,000 feet, covers by a thunder carpet reaching the intensity of 110 decibels an area 90 miles wide. This already constitutes a direct threat to the health of mankind.

The problem of noise is not a new one, though, for man. Ancient China solved it in its own fashion. In the third century B.C. under the law of Ming-Ti, criminals were executed by chiming bells! "Criminals should not be hanged, but flutes, drums and the chime of bells should be sounded without let up, until they drop dead, because this is the most agonizing death man could ever think of . . . Ring, ring the bells without interruption until the criminals turn first insane, then die."

In the days of medieval England, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, husbands were forbidden, under strictest penalty, to beat their wives. However, this was not a sign of the emancipation to come. The English medieval society was interested exclusively in maintaining quiet during the night and they were fighting all possible sources of noise and disruption. There were no objections to beating wives in the daytime.

When the Hitler executioners were not successful in breaking the will power of their victims, they resorted to noise and through it obtained confessions.

With the harm coming from noise mankind was familiar already many, many years ago. The boiler-makers' deafness had been known long time ago likewise. But never before had the problem of noise loomed so acutely and so threateningly. The harm which the industrial "progress" had done with its noise to mankind is without precedents in the history of mankind. Life of our civilization is filled, even flooded with noise. The traffic in the cities, the radio, the television. The noise of the aviation motors penetrates everywhere and turns whole regions into "boiler-makers' shops", threatening hearing, nerves, the emotional and the mental well-being of man. But it is especially the thunder of the supersonic jets that causes damage, irreparable damage, alike to man, to the animal and the vegetative world!

A Swiss forester told me once: "When I am making my rounds and there are no airplanes in the vicinty, foxes, deer, hares and other animals, at the slightest noise announcing my approach, scatter away. But if nearby there is heard the thunder of an airplane, all animals are transfixed, they are immobilized in their stances—I could have easily put them away in my pocket."

French bee-keepers energetically protested against the jet flights over their apiaries because under the influence of the sonic boom bees lost their sense of direction and stopped collecting their honey while the larvae in the bee-hives all perished.

From England also came the news that in Windsor, elephants of a circus performing went on strike against the noise of the jets which flew over the circus. The elephants resumed their performance only after the airdrome, at the request of the director of the circus, routed the planes on another air lane.

Experiments performed in laboratories scientifically established and proved that even the plankton of the oceans—this inexhaustible reserve of food in case of overpopulation—on our planet—even the plankton if subjected to the effects of supersonics five to ten seconds suffers changes with disastrous results. In five minutes the protoplasm of the chloroblast turns into a homogenous pendant; the grains of starch change their structure and condense. As a result a discoloration takes place and the cells perish.

II

Yet the dangers which modern technology causes for the welfare of mankind are by no means restricted to the sonic boom.

Douglas MacFarlane, an outstanding specialist for ear diseases, in his paper read before the Sixth International Congress in Washington, made the following warning: "A handful of atomic material will drive a thousand factories or will destroy a city in a flash. A jet engine will take a plane from coast to coast in three hours. It can also cause profound deafness in three minutes, a deafness that is irreversible and permanent for lifetime. We are indeed in an age when enormous man-made forces can be released for both good and harm. Much of the dangers of these forces comes from the fact that they cannot be detected by the senses. The Japanese fishermen did not notice the atomic fall-out, the workers in the New Jersey factory who were painting luminous numbers on watch dials observed nothing. The early x-ray workers were conscious of no danger until their skin became sallow, and toes, hands and arms began to require amputation. Supersonics are here, and more so than ever before, even though they are not sensed. High speed cutting tools, combustion engines, power transmissions, and electronic equipment of many sorts give frequency components that can undoubtedly damage humans. It is valuable, and timely, to have dangers brought to our attention, for it is wise to be wise in time". (D. McFarlane, 1956).

Eight million people, residents of New York, talking simultaneously, will produce a vocal energy the intensity of which would be sufficient to light a sixty Watt bulb. And at the same time, only part of the energy of the voice of one man is capable, by its harmonic vibrations, the supersonic ones, to break into smithereens a glass goblet. Thus it follows that the main destructive influence exercised on the health of man, is not the power nor the intensity of the sound but only the *frequency of sound vibrations*.

As the nation which is the most advanced technically, the United States of America is involved deeper than any other country in the problems of sound. The average American is awakened in the morning by the alarm clock. To shave himself, he uses the vibrating electrical razor. He may be even cleaning his teeth with a vibrating electrical tooth brush. While he is eating his breakfast he is exposed to the vibrations of the radio. He makes use of the vibrating elevator and gets in his car, turns on the motor and goes to work. During his working hours he makes frequent and prolonged telephone calls, being exposed to the vibrating telephone membrane. And in the evening he looks at the TV, listens to the radio or to his record-playing set—which are all sound amplifiers depending on transistors which are composed of quartz, germanium and similar sources of supersonic energy.

Add to this the thundering sound of jets which by themselves are already sufficient to destroy the hearing nervous system of man and cause deafness, and the problem of sound is outlined in all its frightening but unfortunately not preceivable dimensions.

We in the United States cause the greatest amount of noise. And our nemesis is the greatest, proportionally speaking: the distribution of deafness and also of mental diseases. The latest statistics bring sad totals: at least fifteen million Americans suffer from impaired hearing. This is the number of patients registered in corresponding hospitals and curative institutions.

If you add to this number all those who conceal their deafness or do not apply for medical help, the number marked by the statistics will be doubled and tripled. Thus, it is not surprising that 50 per cent of all the hospital beds in the United States are occupied by mentally ill patients.

However, other industrially developed countries are also making big strides in catching up or even overtaking the U.S. For example, the report of the Federal Department of Workers' Insurance in West Germany stresses the significant increase of nervous diseases. In 1961, for every thousand sick men, five hundred, in other words, one half, were suffering from mental diseases: an increase of twenty per cent, as compared with 1959. Among female employees, who applied for medical treatment, the number of those suffering from mental diseases reached 75 per cent ("New York Times", August 16, 1964).

The effect of the noise of supersonic jets on the nervous system results in its physical destruction. The human ear—this gateway to the stimulation of thoughts and feelings—

finds itself in danger. Our hearing apparatus is economical, precise and fragile. The units of the power of sound are called decibels. The rustle of the leaves reaches ten decibels; the noise of the normal conversation reaches sixty decibels. But the noise exceeding seventy decibels may already seriously threaten and injure the nervous cell.

No better is the case of the vibratory energy. By experiments in laboratories it was proven, as well as it was confirmed by the Oklahoma experience, already previously mentioned, that under the influence of supersonic vibrations, which vibrations man does not perceive, the biological tissues, and in the first place the nervous systems, the bone cells, lose their chemical element. The ferments are being destroyed; the cell loses its ability to synthesize in the higher polymers of the albumen the elementary amino acids—the ribonucleic acid and the deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA), which are necessary for the functioning of the nervous system! The albumin coagulates and degenerates. The emotional and mental activities are disturbed.

In the bones, vibrations form otosclerotic foci. The bone chain of the middle ear, as a result of irritation, forms a new tissue—the bone cement. What takes place is the knitting of bones—producing ankylosis and deafness. Otology, for generations at a stretch, for over a hundred years, stressed that vibration or noise, which penetrate the system of bones of the hearing organ, first cause also the porosity of the bones, the osteoporosis, which turns into otosclerosis. The porosity of the bone tissues is now being discovered also among the pilots and astronauts.

The dogs Ugolick and Veterok during their twenty-two days stay in the cosmos, lost as a result of vibrations, acting on the organism, more than a quarter of the contents of calcium of their bodies, their muscular mass and the control of their movements. Their pulse, the velocity of their blood settling and the number of their white blood corpuscles increased.

The loss of calcium, the osteoporosis, could have been observed likewise among the population of Oklahoma which had been exposed to a six month long sonic boom.

The tragedy of the situation is aggravated by the fact that medical science, frankly speaking, is powerless to fight the evil caused by modern technology. The only possibility in bringing back hearing was seen in corresponding operations. But operations are only palliatives. A few months pass by, a year or two—and deafness returns. Physicians performed and still perform operations. They change their operation technique; they change their methods and their materials; fat, fibrin, veins, fascia, polyethylene, steel, platinum, tantalum, bone, teflon and other plastimasses—everything was tried and tested and with the same result. All these names became synonymous with failures!

All data, which were accumulated by life and by laboratory experiments, were made known to the General Secretary of the United Nations and to other statesmen. U Thant was the first to call the attention of the World Health Organization (WHO) to the gravity of the problem of noise in modern life. And this organization included on the agenda, as a matter of urgency, of the International Day of Health on April 7, 1966, the problem of how to *fight noise*.

Referring to the same problem, Lyndon B. Johnson, the President of the United States of America, in his address had declared: "The overloading with noise is without precedent and it poses a serious threat to the health and the welfare of mankind. . . . Our country has awakened and is ready to join the ranks of fighters. I speak in the name of all Americans when I state: we are taking up the challenge and the responsibility connected with it."

To forestall the fact that man falls a victim to an unlimited noise must become the first and foremost and immediate task of the United Nations, and especially of the World Health Organization.

Four hundred years ago Montaigne wrote in his "Essays": "A fertile and natural exercise of our mind is, in my opinion, conservation. And, therefore, if I were given a choice I would rather lose my eyesight than my hearing, or my speech."

Robert Koch fifty years ago predicted: "A day will come when man will have to fight noise relentlessly as the bitterest enemy of his health—the way he had fought many years ago the plague and the cholera."

Now this day has come.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 21, 1966]

JET NOISE: "NIX"—BRITONS STUDY WAYS TO CONTROL AND REDUCE AIRCRAFT PROBLEM

(By Melita Knowles)

LONDON.—When this correspondent moved out of the Westminster area four years ago to live a few miles from London Airport, friends commiserated about probable aircraft noise.

Today former neighbors living in Westminster are themselves complaining about noise from jets passing directly over London.

From five to 15 miles in four years is the measure of the growing blanket of jet noise spreading outward from London's Heathrow Airport to once relatively quiet areas in the capital itself.

The growing menace of what has become an international problem is underlined by a conference being held in London beginning Nov. 22.

Representatives of 24 countries, gathered at the invitation of the British Government, will discuss ways of controlling and reducing the disturbance from civil-aircraft noise.

COMMITTEES NAMED

The conference accepts that the problem exists, and that it will get worse if not controlled. So its members will split into six committees to consider noise reduction by various means. These are:

Production of quieter aircraft and engines;

Siting of airports; layout, planning, and limiting of housing nearby;

Study of noise-abatement techniques during takeoff, flight, and landing;

Decision on maximum degrees of permitted noise, and how these can be applied;

Insulation of buildings near airports;

Reduction of noise during ground testing of engines.

No specific action will be outlined as a result of the studies. The conference report will suggest possible areas of noise abatement and submit them for study by governments and other relevant authorities.

RATINGS ASSIGNED

There are times for those living near Heathrow—and it always seems to happen when they have guests—when aircraft noise drowns conversation. In technical terms, when "perceived noise decibel"—the experts' term for measuring noise—reaches 90 or more.

The higher the perceived-noise number the more "noise" and vice versa. High-frequency sounds are "noisier" and more objectionable than low-frequency ones. At a rating of 140 the noise is positively painful.

This doesn't often happen. The maximum permitted perceived noise decibel for night takeoffs at present is 102; days it is 110.

The London conference will study these maximum rates to see whether they are a fair compromise between the safety of the relatively small number of passengers in the aircraft and the comfort of the larger number of residents on the ground.

GRANTS AWARDED

When the conference committee studies insulation of buildings near airfields it will probably hear of the scheme operating for residents near Heathrow Airport. The British Ministry of Aviation gives a grant of 50 percent of the sum spent on double glazing a house, up to a limit of £100 ($280).

The ministry has strict standards for the work and few have availed themselves of the grant so far. This correspondent would have to lose practically all windowsills since these would be incorporated into the double panes. There wouldn't be anywhere to put the geraniums in winter.

With regard to siting airfields, the current issue of the consulting engineer has a novel idea for London's proposed third airport. An airport in the middle of the English Channel between Britain and France is proposed by G. E. Bratchell, a London consulting engineer.

BRIDGE SUGGESTED

Built on a sandbank, this airport would have no near neighbors to be bothered by landings or takeoffs of the Anglo-French Concorde or other planned supersonic jetliners.

It would cost some £50 million and rise from the Goodwin Sands, 12 miles off the southeast coast of England.

The Goodwins, scene of the sinking of many a fine ship, would then become a European center for all long-distance aircraft. A bridge might link England to the new-built island by road and rail. This would in turn link up with the English end of the proposed Channel tunnel.

Copies of the plan have been sent to all government and aviation authorities interested in flights to and from Europe.

Residents around Heathrow, and even in Westminster, would certainly welcome the scheme.

[From Trial, published by the American Trial Lawyers Association, August–September 1966]

JET NOISE RESPONSIBLE FOR PSYCHOTIC ILLS

Psychotic ills and jet noise were linked recently at a mental hygiene committee meeting of the New York State Assembly.

State Assemblyman Leonard E. Yoswein, chairman of the committee, introduced a bill to have the state study the effects of jet noise near airports.

Dr. Julius Buchwald, psychiatrist, downstate division, New York State Medical Center, testified that residents of communities afflicted by jet aircraft may develop psychotic symptoms because their dreams are interrupted.

If a person is prevented from dreaming, he said, symptoms such as paranoid delusions, psychoses, hallucinations, and suicidal and homicidal impulses can occur.

The conscious perception of noise can lower a person's productivity and greatly reduce his sense of humor and ability to handle ordinary frustrations, and can even build up frustrations that later explode, the doctor added.

[From the Daily News, Jan. 6, 1967]

FAMILY DOCTOR: MANY PSYCHIATRISTS REGARD NOISE AS THREAT TO HEALTH

(By Dr. Theodore R. Van Dellen)

Noise is synonymous with work and prosperity, but there is a limit on how much the body can tolerate. Some individuals are more sensitive than others, just as the range of hearing varies from one to another. Hearing is disturbed when loud noises are maintained over a long period and unless something is done deafness may ensue.

The early effects result from ear fatigue; hearing returns to normal after an interval of quiet and rest. But when the racket continues year after year the sensitive nerve endings in the ear may be damaged. "Boilermaker's deafness" was one of the first conditions of this nature to be described.

Noise also affects the body in other ways. All manner of vague ills and ailments have been blamed; some sound logical, others are questionable.

There is no doubt that when sleep is disrupted lower efficiency in both manual and mental work may ensue. Years ago, Lord Horder reported that a loud noise caused temporary rise in blood pressure, temporary paralysis of stomach movements, and increases in metabolic rate, the speed of the heart beat, and the rate of respiration.

Fear also produces these changes and there is a question whether the blood pressure, for example, mounts because of noise or of fright. Moreover, our reaction to noise depends upon whether we regard it as unnecessary or unavoidable.

The honking of a horn two or three times a day to attract the attention of the neighbor's daughter is more upsetting than the clatter created by the carpenter who is building a roof on the home down the street.

Many psychiatrists regard noise as one of the most serious threats to health. There are individual variations to noise.

The same sound might reduce the efficiency of a routine worker 5%, whereas an executive will experience a 30% loss. The trend is toward stressing the need for a quieter world. More and more factories and offices are being soundproofed to protect the worker.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 9, 1967]

FAA ISSUES PROPOSALS ON JET NOISE

(By Charles Yarbrough)

The Federal Aviation Agency is proposing new jet departure procedures for National Airport to reduce the ground noise that continues to bring in bitter complaints.

Airlines and all other users of the airport will be, or have been, asked for comments on the proposed procedures, which were revealed today. The proposal would send aircraft out of the airport on longer, lower-powered, overwater ascent.

The FAA has set Jan. 20 as the deadline for industry reply.

Under current rules, which have fallen woefully short of satisfying residents disturbed by the noise, the aircraft take off at full power, climb to 1,500 feet, reduce power, climb to 3,000 and then make their turns.

There have been some admitted violations of the "follow-the-river" rules; some of them explainable by traffic problems.

The new proposal for northwest departures would have the aircraft climb to 1,500 feet, maintain a 500-feet-per-minute climb rate and a speed of 210 knots (235 miles an hour), remaining over the river until abeam of the Georgetown reservoir, then follow a 325-degree course which would keep them over the river until 10 miles out.

Southbound takeoffs would keep planes over the Potomac until five miles out; the planes would then proceed as cleared by air traffic control.

Northwest departures would keep them over the Anacostia River for five miles.

Notice of the proposed rules are going out to the Air Transport Association, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association; the Air Line Pilots Association; National Business Aircraft Association; National Pilots Association and National Aviation Trades Association.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 12, 1967]

SECRETARY UDALL REPORTS JET BOOMS DAMAGE INDIAN CLIFF HOMES

(By Eric Wentworth)

The Thunderbird, a popular figure in American Indian folklore that caused thunder by flapping its wings, has some less-popular space age cousins.

Just ask Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, who called a news conference yesterday to complain that sonic booms from supersonic military aircraft were threatening ancient Indian dwellings in the Southwest that his Department is charged with protecting.

Udall produced a memorandum from Director George B. Hartzog Jr. of the National Park Service reporting that, last Aug. 11, "A Navajo Indian, Guy Yazzie Teller, witnessed a large portion of an overhanging cliff fall and demolish a prehistoric cliff dwelling in Canyon del Muerto. A sonic boom was heard immediately before the cliff section fell."

The incident occurred in Arizona's Canyon de Chelly National Monument, whose red-rock gorges sheltered Pueblo Indians for an estimated 1000 years and more recently have become a home for Navajos.

Park rangers from Aug. 11 through Dec. 22 counted 83 sonic booms over the Canyon de Chelly, and Hartzog speculates that there is "extensive" damage elsewhere in the Monument.

Udall and Hartzog are also concerned about possible damage to the spectacular rock formations in the Bryce Canyon National Park of Utah. "On Oct. 12, shortly after three exceptionally short booms," Hartzog reported, "approximately 10 to 15 tons of dirt and rock was found to have fallen from one of the formations near the bottom of the Navajo Loop Trail."

The Park Service chief reported too that increasing numbers of supersonic planes flew this past year over Mesa Verde National Park, a Colorado tract whose fragile cliff dwellings have made it a well-known tourist stop.

While no direct damage to Mesa Verde's marvels from sonic booms has been discovered, according to Hartzog, one sound wave Dec. 21 was intense enough to rattle windows, doors and lights in the Park Service's own administration building there.

While the Interior officials were clearly concerned about preventing damage to such relics, they were less clear about specific remedies.

Interior officials have unburdened themselves already to the Air Force, and plan to present their findings to the Federal Aviation Agency, which has authority over what planes can fly where in this country. The Air Force said a few days ago it shares Interior's concern, but passed the buck to the FAA.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

SOUND CONDITIONING: SHHH! BUILDERS PICK UP CUE

(By Charles E. Dole)

Home may be a family's castle but there's precious little calm within it.

A cacophony of piercing sounds jars the aural sensitivities both inside the house and out of it. The raucus ring of the telephone, clip-clop of heels, blare of TV or hi-fi, roar of the oil burner, crunch of the disposal, a kitchenful of appliances—all compound into a mighty chorus with a decibel count as high as the ceiling.

Qui-i-et! But that's exactly what millions of Americans have learned to do without.

Nowadays noise is said to cost industry over $4 billion a year in absenteeism, loss of efficiency, higher accident rates, and lower output.

Homes of long ago were of heavier construction, with thicker walls, huge walk-in closets, and higher ceilings. Except for the members of the family themselves, there were few of the sound sources which pile decibel on decibel in a modern domicile.

BARRIERS ERASED

Modern construction is "quick built" of lightweight materials:

Dry-wall partitions instead of lath and plaster;

Hollow doors.

Also, open planning in modern house design allows noise to sweep through the rooms with hardly a barrier to stop it.

Home has become, if not a bedlam, at least something akin to a boiler factory.

Still, builders are hopeful. Jarred by all the noise after the family moves in, they are beginning to do something about it before the family moves in.

A few years ago air conditioning started to take hold as an essential ingredient for comfort in the home. But with room air conditioners came more noise along with the chill air.

TURNOVER NOTED

Now builders are turning to sound conditioning—first in apartments and now in the home.

It is estimated that at least 20,000 apartments in California have been sound-conditioned in the past three years. Apartment owners report that noise is one of the biggest causes of tenant turnover.

Home buyers are perking up their ears. Fox & Jacobs Construction Company of Dallas reports that when the company's first model "quiet home" was opened, more than 4,500 people turned out to see it. Other builders report huge turnouts, even in freezing winter weather.

One San Antonio builder says: "We find the quiet-home theme is a good selling point."

Another says: "We have found purchasers most interested in two items concerning quiet homes—insulation around the furnace and dishwasher units."

COST DISCOUNTED

He adds:

"Yet, we are including interior wall insulation, sound-deadening board in the den area, 'noiseless bathrooms,' silent electrical switches, solid bedroom doors, fiber-glass garage door rollers, six inches of insulation in the attic instead of the usual three, and fiber-glass insulation of air-conditioning ducts."

Sound engineers and builders declare it is not costly to clamp a lid on noise. Acoustically treated homes are said by most builders to cost about 2 percent more than conventional construction.

Insulation board sales were up 24 percent in 1965 over 1964. The industry looks for a 45 percent increase in 1966.

Do it yourselfers are getting into the act, too. The average cost of installing an acoustical-tile ceiling in a 12-by-15-foot room is estimated at under $50. "And it's easy to do," say spokesmen.

INSULATION USED

Sound transmission through walls is reduced by putting up insulation board on the walls and then nailing the paneling to it.

Weatherstripping greatly reduces the noise level through doors.

Among other easy-to-do projects:

Magnetic catches on kitchen cabinets;

Noiseless nylon rollers in the overhead garage doors;

Silent plumbing;

Flexible hose and sponge-rubber gaskets on garbage-disposal units;

Rubber mats under appliances; and

Mercury light switches instead of spring switches.

Appliance manufacturers are cooperating. Refrigerators are less noisy than a few years ago; in fact, it's hard to tell when one is running. Even a "quiet home" records 20 to 40 decibels.

Vast research is going on in sound-deadening materials under the direction of the Insulation Board Institute.

R. A. LaCosse, technical director of the IBI, says: "In European countries building codes today contain noise-control provisions.

"Experts believe it is only a question of time before most regional and local American builder codes also recognize noise as a problem.'"

[From the New York Times, Nov. 27, 1966]

SEXES ARE FOUND EQUAL IN HEARING—BUT WOMEN HAVE A GREATER PROTECTION AGAINST NOISE

WASHINGTON, November 26.—The sexes are equally endowed in hearing sensitivity, but women have greater natural protection than men against some kinds of noise, a study suggests.

The reason appears to be that women have stronger muscles in their middle ears. As a result, they are better protected against low-frequency roars and rumbles, research at the University of Minnesota indicates.

Furthermore men have larger outer ears and these are better collectors and transmitters of low-frequency sound. Women, on the other hand, appear to be more adept than men at hearing high-pitched sound against a background of low-pitch noise.

It is conceivable that there might be somewhat less hearing loss in industry if women had more of the noisy jobs, a report on the research said. There is so much individual variation, however, that this would be a doubtful basis for hiring practices, the scientist in charge of the research said.

STUDENTS VOLUNTEERED

The conclusions on the susceptibility of men and women to effects of noise came from a study of 24 men and 25 women, all college students who volunteered for hearing tests over a period of 8 weeks. The intensity and duration of the test sounds were kept low enough to avoid any permanent damage to hearing. The tests measured the temporary changes in hearing threshold produced by exposure to various kinds of noise.

The purpose, Dr. W. Dixon Ward, director of the University of Minnesota Hearing Research Laboratory said, was to find out how a person's susceptibility to noise varied with the type of sound. In the course of this work the scientists found some distinct sex differences in the human reaction to noise.

Men were more susceptible to temporary hearing impairment from low-pitch noise—sound waves below 1,000 cycles a second. These would sound like low-pitch roars. The sexes were equal in their susceptibility to sounds of middle frequency—1,000 to 2,500 cycles a second. The hearing of women was more affected by sounds of higher pitch, including those high enough to be heard as whistles.

A logical explanation of the findings, Dr. Ward said in an interview by telephone, is that muscles in women's middle ears are stronger than those of men.

The women's greater sensitivity to high-pitch sound and tolerance for low-pitch sound make it seem logical that women might be better than men at hearing high-pitch tones over backgrounds of low-pitch noise. The research in Minnesota has not tested this, however.

The middle ear muscles, called the stapedius and the tensor tympani, help control the vibrations of the structures in the middle ear that transmit low-frequency sound. When the muscles are tensed the vibrations are lessened thus somewhat stifling the sound transmitted to the inner ear and thence to the brain.

The research is supported by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and was originally reported in the August issue of the Journal of the Acoustical Society of America. Further publications are being prepared. At present the research group is doing similar, but more intensive tests with chinchillas.

The purpose is to see if more intensive noise exposure will produce permanent hearing loss that correlates with the temporary changes observed in men and women. Chinchillas were chosen as the experimental animals because they are relatively free from ear diseases and have life spans of six years or more, Dr. Ward said.

LT. GOV. SAMUEL SHAPIRO—KETER SHEM TOV—THE CROWN OF A GOOD NAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take this opportunity today to join with my colleagues from Illinois in calling attention of Congress to the testimonial dinner being sponsored by the Jewish National Fund in Chicago on January 31 in honor of Samuel Shapiro, Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, who has been honored by this fine organization as man of the year.

Our State of Illinois is one in which we all take pride—those of us fortunate enough to represent it in Congress and our fellow Americans who count it among the most progressive and forward-looking States in the country.

Lieutenant Governor Shapiro is our "Mr. Sam" in Illinois. He is a man of enormous, proven ability and talent. He has served the State with a distinction unequaled both as private citizen and public servant.

The Jewish National Fund is awarding to him the Keter Shem Tov—the Crown of a Good Name—at this dinner January 31. Lieutenant Governor Shapiro embodies the finest traditions of modern man, for he is deeply involved in the challenges confronting our community and our Nation.

Sam Shapiro is a humanitarian and a leader among men. The Bible says that there are three important crowns in life—one of priesthood, one of royalty, one of learning—and the Crown of a Good Name ranks above all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include in the RECORD today a few brief highlights of this great American's career. His life of service is an example to all those who seek a meaningful, wholehearted contribution to our world community. I also ask that my colleagues be granted permission to join in this tribute.

I call particular attention to the excellent editorial by Mr. Fishbein, publisher of the Sentinel, who called Lieutenant Governor Shapiro one of the original sponsors of the Illinois Mental Health Act, which has done so much to help deal with one of the most serious unmet needs of our Nation.

Illinois, and, yes, Mr. Speaker, our entire Nation is so much the richer that a man like Sam Shapiro has agreed to work in the difficult vineyard of public service. His profound contribution to the progress of Illinois and America is a living monument to his dedication, his ability and his nobility as a grateful member of a magnificent people.

Mr. Speaker, this inspiring information follows:

LT. GOV. SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO

Born April 25, 1907, Samuel H. Shapiro (Democrat) was reared in Kankakee where he attended the public grade schools and was graduated from Kankakee High School. After attending St. Viator College, he enrolled at the University of Illinois, and obtained his law degree of LL.B. in 1929. Since then he has been practicing law in Kankakee. In 1933, Mr. Shapiro became City Attorney for Kankakee, and was elected State's Attorney of Kankakee County on the Democratic ticket in 1936.

During World War II, he enlisted and served in the Navy, being attached to the anti-submarine warfare unit. Upon his return from the service, he was elected in 1946 as a member of the House of Representatives where he served fourteen years. He served on the Judiciary, Appropriations and Executive Committees, and in the 1959 Session he was Chairman of the Public Aid, Health, Welfare and Safety Committee.

The field of Mental Health and Public Welfare received his special attention while he was a house member. He was one of the principal co-sponsors of the Illinois Mental Health Code, the Mental Deficiency Code, and other progressive mental health legislation, and was Chairman of the Mental Health Commission established in the 1955 Session. In the 1959 Session, he sponsored the establishing of a permanent Commission on Mental Health and is presently its Chairman.

Mr. Shapiro is a member of the American, Illinois and Kankakee County Bar Associations, Kankakee Chamber of Commerce, Country Club, Kiwanis Club, Royal Order of Moose, Elks (Past Exalted Ruler) Covenant Club of Illinois, B'nai B'rith, American Legion, Amvets and Temple B'nai Israel, was State Secretary and State Treasurer of the Young Democrats of Illinois, Past President of the Musician's Union and Kankakee Federation of Labor, Past National President of Alpha Epsilon Pi Fraternity, a Director of the Illinois Mental Health Association, and member of the National Civil Rights Committee of the Anti-Defamation League. Former member of the Council on the Improvement of the Economic and Social Status of Older People. He also served on the Inter-Governmental and Narcotics Commissions.

Elected Lieutenant Governor in 1960. He was reelected in 1964. He resides with his wife Gertrude at 1300 Cobb Boulevard in Kankakee.

LT. GOV. SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO TO BE RECIPIENT OF STATEWIDE TRIBUTE BY THE JEWISH NATIONAL FUND

Illinois Lieutenant Governor Samuel H. Shapiro has been selected as the honored guest for a state-wide testimonial banquet held on behalf of the Jewish National Fund. The selection announcement was made by local campaign chairman, William J. Robinson. State of Illinois auditor of public accounts, Michael J. Howlett, will serve as the banquet chairman for the gala salute.

The testimonial, set for Tuesday evening, January 31, 1967, at Chicago's Palmer House, will climax a record breaking year-round effort by local J.N.F. activities. In recognition of his continued support and interest in the many J.N.F. re-development projects in Israel, Lt. Gov. Shapiro will be awarded the coveted "Keter Shem Tov"—a symbolic religious citation representing the "Crown of a good name." This specially-designed presentation depicts the significance of being esteemed and respected by your fellow man for exemplifying the positive qualities of humanitarianism. The Scriptures explain that life carries three important crowns—one of priesthood—one of royalty—one of learning, and the Crown of a good name supersedes them all.

The significance of this tribute is reflected in the J.N.F. projects taking place in Israel. Among the most vital are Land Development,

which involves building roads and land clearances for settlements which would allow the Israel population to expand to all the borders and to protect the security of Israel in its entirety. Secondly, Tree Planting, which secures fertility of soil for abundant agricultural settlements so that Israelis can produce from natural resources within their own state. Also, drainage of water-logged and swamp areas which increases the potential development of all areas.

Lt. Gov. Shapiro has displayed his leadership in scores of vital roles with numerous civic, communal, and philanthropic organizations. His selection for the state-wide tribute was made by a special J.N.F. committee including Col. Jacob M. Arvey, honorary campaign chairman; Morris R. DeWoskin; William J. Robinson, president of the local J.N.F. campaign; Rabbi Harold Trattner, Executive Director of Chicago J.N.F. and Harold Rosenberg. The selection of Lt. Gov. Shapiro was unanimously passed by the board representing every major Jewish organization including: Hadassah, Zionist organization of Chicago, Pioneer Women, B'nai B'rith, Labor Zionists, Farband and the Religious Zionists.

The January 31 banquet is expected to have more than 2,000 well-wishers and friends in attendance. Prior to this culminating banquet, a series of advance meetings, to be planned and coordinated by Chairman Howlett, will be held. A steering committee presently in formation has already more than 65 members on its roster. This committee consists of leaders from every major Illinois city.

Banquet chairman, Howlett, stated that Lt. Gov. Shapiro was selected for such an honor "Because of his many dedicated years of public service . . . because of his consecrated devotion to the Jewish people . . . because of his selfless efforts to all humanitarian causes . . . because he represents the finest synthesis of Judaism and Americanism. . . . The Jewish National Fund of Chicago takes pride in conferring upon him the coveted Keter Shem Tov Award and establishing a forest in the Judean Hills of Jerusalem, thereby eternally linking his name with the holy soil of Israel."

[From the Sentinel, Dec. 29, 1966]

HE REALLY DESERVES IT!

(By J. I. Fishbein, publisher)

Every regular reader of The Sentinel knows that we do not look with reverence on the usual "Man of the Year" banquets.

Occasionally, however, someone comes along who is genuinely deserving of the honor. Such a rarity, in our opinion, deserves double notice.

We are happy, therefore, to call our readers' attention to the honoree selected by the Jewish National Fund—Lieutenant Governor Samuel H. Shapiro. Here is a man who in the fullest sense has earned the coveted "Keter Shem Tov"—Crown Of The Good Name.

He is in the highest degree an honor and a credit to our people. His entire record of public service has been one of unblemished and dedicated effort on behalf of his state. We know of no one who has ever been able to say otherwise.

In November, 1960, he was elected to his present office of Lieutenant Governor and was presented a resolution and trophy by the entire membership of the State Senate indicating his fairness in presiding over that body.

"Mr. Sam of Illinois," the name by which he has become known, received his law degree of LL.B. at the University of Illinois in 1929, after taking some of his pre-legal work at St. Viator College.

In 1933 he became city attorney for Kankakee, and was elected state's attorney of Kankakee County in the Democratic ticket in 1936.

During World War II he enlisted and served in the Navy, being attached to the anti-submarine warfare unit. Upon his return from the service, he was elected, in 1946, as a member of the Illinois House of Representatives, where he served for 14 years (seven terms).

As state representative he served on the Judiciary, Appropriations, and Executive Committees, and in the 1959 session he was chairman of the Public Aid, Health, Welfare and Safety Committee. The field of mental health and public welfare received his special attention.

Known as "Mr. Mental Health," he was one of the principal co-sponsors of the original Illinois Mental Health Code, the Mental Deficiency Code, and other progressive legislation, and was chairman of the Mental Health Commission established in the 1955 Session. The report of that commission has been used as a guide for much of the present mental health legislation. In the 1959 Session, he sponsored the establishing of a permanent Commission on Mental Health which was one of the major steps forward taken by the General Assembly in this field. He was appointed chairman in 1961, and is presently chairman of this commission. He is also presently serving as chairman of the Governor's Advisory Council on Mental Retardation.

Lt. Governor Shapiro has served as a member of the Council on the Improvement of Economic and Social Status of Older People, the Narcotics Commission and is presently a member of the Inter-Governmental Commission, and the Legislative Council. In December 1962 he was elected chairman of the National Conference of Lieutenant Governors.

"Mr. Sam" is, in addition, a proud and active Jew. He typifies the truism that "A Better Jew is a Better American." We ourselves have never known him to turn down a Jewish cause to which he could possibly be of help. As a matter of fact, we just don't know anyone in this community who doesn't admire and affectionately respect our Sam Shapiro.

It goes without saying that his testimonial banquet on Jan. 31 must be a tribute to this love and esteem. All of us ought to do more than what is routinely required. We owe this man a special effort.

SENATOR EUGENE J. MCCARTHY WILL SPEAK AT JNF TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR SHAPIRO

Minnesota's distinguished United States Senator, Eugene J. McCarthy, will address the more than 1,500 guests expected to be in attendance at the "Keter Shem Tov—Crown of a Good Name" tribute banquet to be tendered to Illinois Lt. Gov. Samuel H. Shapiro. The salute, the culminating event of 1966 Jewish National Fund activities, will be held Tuesday evening, January 31, 1967 at Chicago's Palmer House.

Leading up to the tribute is a series of advanced testimonials which are being held throughout the state. Included in the calendar of events are parties scheduled for Peoria, Joliet, Rockford, Kankakee, and Rock Island. Coordinating a committee list of 100 statewide leaders is State of Illinois Auditor, Michael J. Howlett. Included on the list are outstanding members of the business, governmental, civic, and educational fields. Mr. Howlett reported that "This much-deserved tribute to one of our state's leading citizens is certain to be a milestone in Lt. Gov. Shapiro's life. This tribute marks a much-deserved honor bestowed upon a man who has given so much to his fellow man through his many years of dedicated public service."

At the January 31 event a symbolic jeweled and hand-engraved crown will be presented to Lt. Gov. Shapiro by William Jay Robinson, president of the J.N.F. Another of the evening's highlights will be the appearance of Sen. McCarthy who is widely known as an orator and writer of political, economic, and social problems. He was elected to the U.S. Congress in 1948. Senator McCarthy represented Minnesota's 4th Congressional District in the House of Representatives for ten years. In 1958 he was elected to his first six year term in the U.S. Senate and re-elected to that position in 1964.

[This message presented as a public service by Max S. Steiner, president, Clifford Peterson Tool Co., Chicago]

Max S. Steiner Says: "Lt. Gov. Samuel H. Shapiro Deserves The 'Crown Of The Good Name'—He Is A Most Loyal Team-Mate Of Governor Kerner"

Just as the No. 2 auto rental agency is always trying to outshine the No. 1 firm, so in government, we find many examples of where the No. 2 man tries to outshine his superior, especially when his "boss" is away from his post.

In Illinois, we are fortunate that Lt. Gov. Samuel H. Shapiro has no aspirations to outshine Gov. Otto Kerner. In fact, I have heard Gov. Kerner say publicly that when he is out of the country and Lt. Gov. Shapiro becomes the governor, that he leaves the state "in the best hands possible, knowing full well that there is a man back in Illinois who is personally loyal to me and the people of the State of Illinois."

It is unusual that among the two top executives of a state, there should be such a lack of bickering, back-biting and conflict. Lt. Gov. Shapiro has proven to be the good right arm of the governor whether Kerner is in the state or out of it. In fact, during the few times the governor may have had rough going, it was Lt. Gov. Shapiro who proved to be his most loyal supporter and dedicated friend.

The Jewish National Fund is honoring Lt. Gov. Shapiro at a state-wide dinner on Jan. 31 at the Palmer House. They will confer upon him the "Keter Shem Tov" (Crown of the Good Name), an honor he richly deserves.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a former Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, I am especially pleased that the present Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, the distinguished and beloved Hon. Samuel H. Shapiro, has brought such honor and national acclaim to an office it was my privilege to occupy over half a century ago. I commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], for arranging this time today so that we in the Congress can join in tribute, admiration, and affection to a great son of Illinois. The friends of Sam Shapiro are legion. They fill every county and every city and hamlet in Illinois. His smile, his kindly interest in people, his helping hand are as well known to the people of Illinois as are his rare traits of statesmanship and his masterly legislative skill. His public career is certain to continue with ever-increasing brilliance and to the honor and glory of Illinois.

Samuel H. Shapiro, Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, is in every sense of the word a son of Illinois. Born and reared in Kankakee, he attended public grade and Kankakee High School. After attending St. Viator's College, he enrolled at the University of Illinois where he obtained his law degree in 1929. He returned to Kankakee, to practice law and

become city attorney and State's attorney.

During World War II he served in the Navy where he was attached to the Anti-Submarine Warfare Unit. In 1946, he was elected a member of the house of the Illinois Legislature where he served 14 years. He was one of the principal cosponsors of the Illinois Mental Health Code, the Illinois Mental Deficiency Code, and other progressive mental health legislation and was chairman of the Illinois Mental Health Commission. He is presently chairman of the permanent Illinois Commission on Mental Health. He was elected Lieutenant Governor of Illinois in 1960.

Some years ago when my friends were honoring me on my birthday Lieutenant Governor Shapiro traveled from Springfield to Chicago, at his own expense and considerable inconvenience, to be with me on that occasion, and I have not forgotten. Sam Shapiro is that kind of man, and that is why he is so beloved from one part of Illinois to another.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my congressional colleagues from Illinois in extending heartiest congratulations to my good friend, the distinguished Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, Sam Shapiro.

We who served with and revered the late great Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, were pleased to call him "Mr. Sam." It was a term of endearment, of affection for one whom everybody acknowledged to be a great leader and a great man.

Illinoisans have given the same appellation to Sam Shapiro. He is our "Mr. Sam" and he bears that title proudly and with distinction. As President of the Illinois Senate, he has conducted himself in that high office with dignity, with fairness, with courage, with wisdom, and with great ability. His administration has given the people of Illinois a shining example of the highest quality of public service.

Sam Shapiro is a unique man, a man possessed of outstanding personal traits. His warmth and friendliness, his willingness to help others, his modesty and restraint, his insight and perception, his humanitarianism have given him a place of honor in the hearts of all who have come to know him.

It is well that Sam Shapiro has been designated to wear the Keter Shem Tov, "the crown of a good name" by the Jewish National Fund, and that distinguished organization is to be congratulated for having selected him for that high honor. Truly, this event will be a most appropriate symbolization of a lifelong wearing of that crown.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call him my friend.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was during the 68th General Assembly of the State of Illinois that I first had the privilege of meeting Mr. Samuel H. Shapiro, the man who is now Lieutenant Governor of that State. The year was 1953 and both Mr. Shapiro and I were representatives to the State assembly. I was tremendously impressed with him then, and I am still tremendously impressed with him now.

I shall always remember him as the man who walked over to me, a new representative, and volunteered his every assistance. Since that meeting, Sam Shapiro has grown continually in my affections and he has certainly grown continually in stature in the State of Illinois.

In recognition of his outstanding record of public service, the Jewish National Fund will present to Lieutenant Governor Shapiro, on January 31, 1967, a special Keter Shem Tov Award, which means "Crown of Good." I am delighted to have this occasion to add my own personal salute to my good friend, Sam Shapiro. He truly bears the qualities of executive leadership, but even more than that, he is a human being who has compassionate understanding and who has certainly offered to all people seeking knowledge, the benefit of his own.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my distinguished colleauge, the Honorable ROMAN PUCINSKI from Chicago, and my other Illinois colleagues in paying tribute to one of Illinois' outstanding citizens and Lieutenant Governor—Mr. Sam Shapiro.

"Sam," as he is affectionately known in Illinois, has been selected by the Jewish National Fund as Man of the Year and will be honored in Chicago on January 31. Many men in public life are selected to receive high honor, but Sam has earned this honor by virtue of his hard work, his dedication, and his devotion to the people of our State.

I have had the good fortune of knowing Sam Shapiro since 1949. While I was serving as director of the Illinois Department of Labor, Sam, at the same time, was a member of the Illinois Legislature. As a member of the legislature, he conscientiously and consistently voted for programs that would benefit the economic, social, and educational needs of the people.

In 1960, Sam was honored by the Democratic Party by being nominated to the office of Lieutenant Governor. He was elected Lieutenant Governor in 1960, and was reelected in 1964. In that capacity, he has interested himself in the problems of all of the people of Illinois and he has diligently assisted Governor Kerner and the members of both the house and senate in their efforts to meet the needs and wants of the people of Illinois.

I am happy to join his many friends in commending Sam and in congratulating the Jewish National Fund on their selection of Sam Shapiro as their Man of the Year. I want also to congratulate his very charming and wonderful wife on the tribute being bestowed on her husband, and to congratulate the other members of the Shapiro family.

I know that Sam Shapiro is highly deserving of this honor. May he enjoy an abundance of good health so that he can continue his constructive and outstanding service of the people of our great State of Illinois.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 31 the Jewish National Fund is honoring Samuel Shapiro with the Keter Shem Tov Award. Mr. Sam of Illinois, as he is popularly known, is most certainly deserving of this honor, which means "Crown of a Good Name."

Samuel Shapiro has made an outstanding record as Lieutenant Governor of the great State of Illinois and has gained great stature as a leader and as a humanitarian. He is truly a special kind of person who spends virtually all of his time in doing things for other people. He has worked unselfishly and untiringly in behalf of others and his contribution to the people of Illinois cannot be measured.

It certainly is most appropriate that Samuel Shapiro be given the Crown of a Good Name.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to join my colleagues from Illinois in congratulating our outstanding Lt. Gov. Sam Shapiro on being selected to receive the Man of the Year Award by the Jewish National Fund. Mr. Sam, as we affectionately call Lieutenant Governor Shapiro, is a man of rare talents. He has proven ability to represent Illinois in the finest tradition. Sam has been a great leader in the field of mental health. He has led the fight for many pieces of progressive legislation both as a lawmaker and as presiding officer of the State senate.

Mr. Speaker, as my esteemed colleagues from Illinois have pointed out, Sam Shapiro is highly deserving of this signal honor being bestowed upon him by the Jewish National Fund in Chicago on January 31. I want to add my congratulations to Mr. Sam and wish for him many more healthy, happy years of dedicated service.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with my Illinois colleagues in extending congratulations to our distinguished Lieutenant Governor of the State of Illinois, Samuel H. Shapiro, upon being named as the Man of the Year by the Jewish National Fund. Sam will be the guest of honor at the Jewish national fund testimonial dinner on January 31, at which time he will be awarded the Keter Shem Tov—the Crown of a Good Name.

Having known Sam Shapiro for many years including service together in the Illinois State Legislature, I can easily attest to the fact that there is no one more deserving than he for this high honor. He will wear well this symbolic crown. I am certain that he will continue to epitomize those qualities and characteristics for which he was chosen and for which he has long been recognized, and thereby add new luster to this coveted award.

It is my earnest hope that Sam will enjoy his newest honor in good health and that we may all continue to be beneficiaries of his good work for years to come. I also with to express my best wishes to his family who undoubtedly are rightfully proud of him on this august occasion.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Illinois in commending the Committee of the Jewish National Fund for designating the Honorable Samuel H. Shapiro, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Illinois, as their Man of the Year.

I can readily understand this designation because of the outstanding work performed by Governor Shapiro in the field of mental health as indicated by a record of his performance in this field

such as being cosponsor of the Illinois mental health code, the mental deficiency code, and other progressive mental health legislation, and also because of his chairmanship of the Mental Health Commission established in 1955.

I congratulate Governor Shapiro on being the recipient of this high honor.

I regret my inability to be present in Chicago on Tuesday, January 31, to witness the presentation of the special "Keter Shem Tov Award" to him.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may include their remarks following my remarks in a tribute to Lt. Gov. Sam Shapiro of Illinois.

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

There was no objection.

THE TRUTH IN TRADING STAMPS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is about time that Congress adheres to the cry of America's homemakers who seek the frills eliminated from food sales. We, here in this august Chamber, if we do not act now, will continue to force the women to pay for an additional week's supply of food each year.

I am today introducing a bill which, when enacted, will help to roll back food prices and increase the coffers of the U.S. Treasury. This bill is entitled, "The Truth in Trading Stamps Act."

It is identical to the bill which I introduced on October 21, 1966, prior to the close of the 89th Congress. That bill was introduced at that time so that my distinguished colleagues could have the opportunity to review the text of the measures I prescribed and would sound out their own respective districts on the tenor of the shoppers this bill was designed to protect.

If the constituents of my colleagues districts were like mine, they were bombarded by the homemakers who have come into their own throughout America by their strong demonstrations last autumn. Those demonstrations indicated that America's homemakers wanted the frills eliminated from food sales.

Over the past 2 years I have conducted extensive meetings—along with some of my colleagues—across the face of this land. We questioned retailers, consumers, legislators, economists and even trading stamp company officials on their attitude toward trading stamp practices and their respective responsibility to the public.

I have in my possession hours of taped testimony and substantial evidence that there is an urgent need for regulatory action involving this billion-dollar industry.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear now and here that I am not a foe of trading stamps. As a former businessman who used to be engaged in marketing activities I found trading stamps an excellent sales incentive device.

I must confess that my own dear wife, Blanche, has many of our bureau drawers stuffed with untold quantities of these unredeemed, unofficial treasures of the realm.

There are many trading stamp companies across this country who are engaged in legitimate sales promotional ventures.

My brief is not with the reputable but with the disreputable companies who stalk this land and rob our shoppers of untold millions each day, at the same time depriving the U.S. Treasury of a fair share of tax revenues. And the trading stamp companies can do this now because there is no standard Federal regulation to govern their activities.

Of the 48 out of the 50 States who permit trading stamps, there are approximately 48 different sets of highly questionable standards by which these companies operate.

This august body has seen fit in the past to exercise a degree of influence and control on industries engaged in equal if not lesser financial influence over the American public.

Certainly those industries engaged in interstate practices such as banking, trucking, and the like are not immune from Federal regulatory measures. How then can we reason that trading stamp companies that deal, by their own admission, with 80 percent of all American homes; an industry that shows an annual increase of over $10 million, and an industry that did an estimated $1 billion in 1966, remain immune to legislative responsibility?

This past congressional recess my district experienced wave after wave of women's organizations calling upon me to do something about the rise in the cost of food prices.

With the introduction of this bill today I am doing just that. And here is why. Trading stamps add 2 percent to the food costs. If this 2 percent were optional and the cost could be turned back to the housewife, those women who desired could save 1 week's free supply of food each year.

If Congress does not adhere to the cry of America's homemakers, they are forcing the women to pay for an additional week's supply of food.

Please note that I use the term optional. I said previously that I am not a foe of trading stamps per se. But I do believe most sincerely that women, or any collector of trading stamps, should have the option of redeeming the stamps for merchandise or cash. However, this is presently impossible.

It is claimed by some that stamps are a form of advertising and therefore the increase is justified. There are many important authorities and the courts who disagree with the theory on the grounds that advertising gives information where and what merchandise is available.

Trading stamps achieve no such purpose. Shoppers pay cash for the right to only borrow these stamps; for the trading stamp companies allege that the stamps are merely loaned to the shopper. At no time are they her property to exchange or transfer.

The retailer as well as the shopper is at the mercy of the stamp company when it comes to determining the redemption value of these stamps. And the stamp company may change that value at their own discretion without prior notice to either retailer or shopper.

How many women are lured into saving for a needed article only to find upon attempting to redeem stamps for the item at one value, find that the value is either increased or the item even deleted. And, while we are on the subject of redemption, permit me to enlighten you, my learned colleagues, on a few eye-opening revelations.

Just how many stamps are redeemed and how much money is involved? Here again the number of stamps redeemed and how much money is involved is questionable. Many feel that as high as 50 percent of the stamps purchased by retailers and distributed to shoppers, never find their way back to the redemption centers. As I said, my wife, I must confess, contributes in some small way to that figure. Leading stamp companies report that they redeem 75 to 95 percent of these stamps. But, under the present system, stamp companies have the privilege of deciding for the Treasury, without verification, their own redemption estimates. If the stamp is valued at one-tenth of a cent and 10 percent are not redeemed, that is $100 million worth of stamps that go unredeemed each year. This being the case there have been no taxes paid on one-half billion dollars of hidden income over the past decade. Had there been, the U.S. Treasury would be richer today by the taxes on one-half billion dollars, or we would have a goodly percentage of the estimated revenue expected to be derived the first year of operation from the President's proposed 6-percent surcharge on Federal income taxes.

The Sperry & Hutchinson Co.—S & H Green Stamps—in a decision handed down in New Jersey stated that they considered the stamp contract a simple contract and that they were not liable, under the statute of limitations of 6 years. Paragraph 14 of answer of Sperry & Hutchinson Co., filed May 31, 1955, in *State of New Jersey* v. *Sperry & Hutchinson Co.*, (S. Ct. N.J. 1956) 127 A (2d) 169. This being the case, my colleagues, they should not be permitted to hold in reserve this money tax free. It should be escheated to the States or there should be taxes paid on it since it is profit.

If you are the least bit curious, and I am sure you are, what happens to these enormous tax-free, and I repeat, tax-free, funds? Here again, research shows that this money is used for expansion and other purposes—a device which I know no other industry enjoys. And again, my colleagues, I repeat I am not against trading stamps as a promotional device. I only ask that their tax-free sanctuary be reexamined and reappraised by the proper authorities and that the proposals of my bill be considered carefully by every Member who is serious in his efforts to reduce the high cost of food prices.

I hold in my hand a copy of a report presented before the marketing legislation class of the University of Cincinnati. It is titled, "The Truth About Trading Stamps." I invite you to exam-

ine its contents carefully. This booklet, distributed by the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., represents 200,000 members throughout the United States. Their report shows clearly that "action to curb abuses of trading stamps plans is long overdue."

Since it is overdue, here is what my bill will do to bring about needed regulatory action:

The Truth in Trading Stamps Act will provide for redemption at the option of the consumer for cash or stamps. Trading stamps have been found not free, and they are not gifts. The bill will prevent any false and deceptive advertising of this type.

The bill will require trading stamp companies to hold adequate reserves, require annual reports, require escheat to the State of any unredeemed stamps, require stamp companies to register with the proposed Commission on Trading Stamp Practices and grant this Commission powers to investigate and penalize any person who omits or fails to comply with the requirements of this act.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks that the bill I have introduced be printed in its entirety.

The tenor of the public is clear, my distinguished colleagues. The time for action is now. And I invite all of you to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

POLL ON VIETNAMESE CONFLICT BY RESPONSIBLE TEENAGERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the students at Lakeland High School in Rathdrum, Idaho, have gone a long way toward dispelling the image of today's teenager as irresponsible.

A recent poll on the Vietnamese conflict, taken in the school's social studies classes, illustrates beyond a doubt that the students are concerned citizens. It is regrettable that a number of those polled are likely to serve with the military in southeast Asia someday. And yet, the responses to the questions seem to have been motivated by concern for the country's welfare rather than concern for self.

To School Principal Richard Snook and Social Studies Department Chairman Dennis F. Carey, my congratulations for the fine job they are doing at Lakeland High. But most of all, I compliment the students themselves for taking an active interest in national problems.

I would like to think that prodding from responsible students throughout the country would pave the way for an in-depth study of Vietnam by the Congress.

The poll follows:

STUDENT VIETNAM POLICY OPINION POLL

(1) Some distinguished commentators have said that Congress has been at fault in not having a full scale debate on the Administration's policies in Viet Nam. Do you agree or disagree? Agree 154, disagree, 93.

(2) If a peace conference in Viet Nam provided for free elections that could result in Communists being part of the Vietnamese government, would you favor such an arrangement or not? Would 40, would not 210.

(3) If our opponents in Viet Nam refuse to negotiate, what should be the U.S. policy?

(a) Withdraw all military forces, 5.

(b) Continue to build up armed forces indefinitely, 39.

(c) Maintain our current strength as a holding force, 38.

(d) Hold our forces at the same level and accelerate bombing of civilian targets in the north, 50.

(e) Increase our ground forces and accelerate bombing of civilian targets in north, 93.

(f) Refer the whole matter to the United Nations for a decision, 22.

(4) Do you agree or disagree that it was wise to change the role of the U.S. military in Viet Nam from advisors to the Viet army to greatly increased participation in the actual fighting? Agree 178, disagree 70.

(5) Newspaper reports from Viet Nam sometimes differ sharply from official government reports. When they differ, which do you think is nearer the truth? The government 87, the newspapers 57, neither 98.

(6) The U.S. Constitution states that Congress has the power to declare war. The Viet Nam war has not been so declared. Do you think that the President should recommend such a formal declaration? Yes 81, no 164 (yes or no).

(7) Do you approve or disapprove of reclassifying the draft status of students to immediate induction if they protest publicly against the administration's policy in Viet Nam? Approve 113, disapprove 133.

(8) Is President Johnson doing a good job as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces? Yes 113, no 103.

Political affiliation of students polled: Republican 57, Democrat 81, independent 106.

LET'S STOP POISONING OUR AIR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to reintroduce a measure which I first sponsored in the 89th Congress to provide an answer to the growing menace of air pollution in the Nation. My bill would call upon the Department of Housing and Urban Development to undertake an immediate program of research and development to produce a feasible alternative to the internal combustion engine. If successful, this program could result in a two-thirds reduction in the pollutants in our atmosphere and a dramatic improvement in the quality of our environment.

When I first introduced this measure, which was similar to a bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, there were many who did not take it seriously.

In the ensuing months, with the leadership of Senator MAGNUSON, and the growing public awareness spurred by the American Public Power Association and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a convincing body of public information has been developed as to the need for action.

Let us look at the facts. In the past 24 hours alone, we Americans dumped nearly 370,000 tons of poisonous garbage into the air we all breathe—and the daily rate is rising rapidly in spite of all our current efforts at abatement and control.

Between now and 1976 we will pour a total of 1,670,000,000 tons of dangerous waste into our atmosphere and the annual pollution rate will have risen by more than 50 percent.

The 133 million tons of measurable particulate pollution we now produce annually already exceeds our total yearly iron and steel production by 2 million tons.

Unless immediate action is taken, air pollution will soon become our largest—and most deadly—product.

Three years ago, the staff of the Senate Public Works Committee reported that this systematic poisoning of our atmosphere was then costing the American public more than $11 billion each year in property damage alone. With the increase in the rate and volume of pollution and general inflation over the past 3 years, this estimate must now be considered extremely conservative.

COST ESTIMATES NEEDED

As far as I have been able to determine, no one has ever tried to estimate the costs that result from such side effects as the devaluation of urban properties near particularly pungent sources of pollution. Nor has anyone computed the havoc that has been inflicted on other important elements of our environment. We do have some hints, however.

At the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science here in Washington, December 25–31, 1966, agricultural experts branded air pollution as the greatest single destroyer of American food crops. They reported that damage from air pollution now costs farmers more than the combined damage of weather and pests. In New Jersey, for example, these experts reported that within the past 5 years air pollution has virtually wiped out the spinach industry. Lettuce, endive, and chicory farmers in the Garden State are now experiencing serious difficulties.

The spread of chemical plants around the Niagara Falls region of my own State of New York has, according to these agricultural experts, all but eliminated farming in this once fertile area.

The U.S. Forest Service reported that sulfur dioxide from the smokestacks of TVA's powerplants has already destroyed 90 percent of Tennessee's white pine trees in one 20-mile radius.

The most tragic cost of all is to the Nation's health. There has been surprisingly little effort to identify what this cost really is, but a frightening, if fragmentary, picture can be gleaned from general statistics.

In the New York metropolitan area, where between 70 and 80 tons of filth fall on each square mile each year, the number of persons dying from lung ailments is doubling every 5 years. Men over 50, who live or work in the metropolitan area are twice as likely to die of lung diseases as their more fortunate peers in less polluted areas.

In the past 36 years the national death rate from lung cancer has soared from 3 per hundred thousand to 26 per hundred thousand, a ninefold increase.

In the 26 years that the Federal Government has kept separate statistics on emphysema and emphysema bronchitis, the number of persons dying of these diseases has increased six times, in spite

of dramatic medical treatments that prolong the life of sufferers.

Wonder drugs have scored impressive victories over infectious lung diseases, but air pollution has scored an even more impressive and deadly victory.

Air pollution, like water pollution and urban slums, is a direct result of our unparalleled economic expansion. Industrial production, power generation, waste disposal and heating, which have contributed so much to our economic leadership, also play key roles in poisoning our atmosphere. Why, then, do we single out the internal combustion engine of the car, bus, and truck for special action now?

Of the total 133 million tons of measurable pollution we are producing annually, the internal combustion engine produces more than 85 million tons—or almost two-thirds. Four-fifths of this total, or about 73 million tons, is produced by the 74 million automobiles in operation in the Nation today. Obviously, if we can find a feasible alternative to the gasoline engine for the car, we can reduce air pollution by more than 50 percent. If that alternative will serve for the 18 million trucks and buses in the Nation, we can reduce the total by better than 63 percent.

CONTROL POLLUTION AT SOURCE

Rather than pressing ahead with alternatives to internal combustion engines, why can we not act to control their pollution?

In 1965 Congress approached the problem by amending the Clean Air Act to require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set standards for the control of automobile emissions. These standards have now been promulgated and are scheduled to go into effect for 1968 cars, but everyone recognizes that they are at best a temporary stopgap.

The most effective and feasible abatement devices available today reduce pollution from cars by about 60 percent. If these most stringent standards were enforced immediately on all new cars, it would affect only 9 million of the estimated 77 million cars on the road in 1968. With the total increase in registrations this would mean an increase in the total pollution of about 2 million tons in 1968 even though the rate of increase would be slightly reduced.

Transportation experts estimate that there will be more than 100 million cars on the roads of this Nation by 1975. In the face of such increase, control devices will not even help us to hold our own.

Furthermore, we have distressing evidence that the control devices will not hold up. In Los Angeles, where regulations went into effect last year requiring all new automobiles to carry pollution control devices, it has been found that after only a few months, the efficiency of these devices is reduced by as much as one-half.

DEADLY BYPRODUCTS OF POLLUTION

What does the internal combustion engine contribute to our environment?

Carbon monoxide, a major emission, kills by preventing the blood from absorbing and carrying oxygen. Recent studies indicate that this gas may be responsible for many of the headaches, nausea, and general impairment of bodily functions that are increasingly frequent complaints of city dwellers.

The effect of concentrations of lead emissions is currently the subject of much debate. Although lead has very toxic effects on humans, we simply do not know whether the substantial emissions from the internal combustion engine reach or harm our citizens.

Another major emission is the oxides of nitrogen which convert into highly toxic nitrogen dioxide. Studies on laboratory animals demonstrate that emphysema and other respiratory ailments are promoted by high concentrations of this gas.

The most damaging byproducts of internal combustion are the unburned hydrocarbons which combine with nitrogen dioxide on warm sunny days to create that deadly new phenomenon of our metropolitan centers, photochemical smog. Smog is exceedingly unpleasant, but more unpleasant still is the related phenomenon of the thermal inversion.

Under certain conditions, the warm layer of smog-laden air, acting as a blanket, entraps all the smoke and smells, all the soot and noxious gases that an urban area produces. Unable to escape from this artificial atmospheric envelope, the air within the city becomes fouler and, in the absence of a fortuitous breeze or other beneficial act of nature, the very air becomes a lethal gas.

In London in 1962 such a phenomenon killed 4,000 people. Similar phenomena have killed in New York, Chicago and Los Angeles.

If there are feasible alternatives to the internal combustion engine that would reduce the pollution by 60 percent, the Federal Government has a clear duty to help develop them.

This is what my bill provides. It authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to undertake necessary research, development, and demonstration programs to produce a feasible alternative to the internal combustion engine with particular emphasis on electric vehicles and their components. It directs the Secretary to cooperate with industry, with the Secretaries of Transportation, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, Defense, and with all other Federal and State agencies and departments concerned. It then authorizes an appropriation of $2 million for the first fiscal year to get the program started.

I do not propose the electric car as the only possible alternative. In carrying out the program under my bill, the Secretary is authorized to explore all feasible power sources and methods of transportation.

Many imaginative proposals have been offered recently which incorporate the use of electric vehicles. A Massachusetts company has developed a system of special small cars—called the Alden StaRRcar system—which travel on regular roads or on a special automatic guideway. While on the guideway, these battery-driven vehicles travel twice as fast as ordinary cars and offer a uniquely safe method of high-speed mass transit.

A feasible "moving sidewalk" is now possible to relieve congestion and speed transportation in our cities.

Another interesting proposal is that of providing electric buses in our national parks to move large numbers of visitors in a smokeless, quiet manner within the park area.

The fact remains, however, that after more than a decade of serious study and investigation the main thrust of scientific thought holds that electric cars are the most feasible alternative available.

I suspect that many who resist the concept of the electric car may be prejudiced by a stereotype resulting from the early electrics. They picture a little old lady in a shawl and long skirts spinning merrily down the road in a converted surrey at the breathtaking rate of 20 miles an hour.

Let me assure this distinguished body that nothing could be further from the truth. I drove to work this morning in an experimental electric car developed by the Yardney Electric Corp. of New York. It is parked right outside the Capitol now and I invite any one of my colleagues to come out and try it.

This car, the Yardney Silvercel, is only an experimental model converted from one of the more popular foreign compacts on the market today. Like the other experimental models built by Exide, Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, and numerous other companies and individuals, it has been put together from existing components to demonstrate the feasibility of the concept. But even this single experimental model proves conclusively to me that an attractive, modern electric vehicle, capable of matching the performance of the gasoline engine in most applications is not a future prospect, but a present reality—if we devote the time and money to perfecting the concept that the project deserves.

ELECTRIC CAR PERFORMANCE

This morning on my way to work, I drove three other passengers in absolute comfort at speeds of up to 55 miles an hour. We accelerated from zero to 30 miles per hour in 5 seconds, optimum performance for a standard car.

The car is operating on four production-model, aviation-type batteries developed for the F-105 fighter bomber.

I want to stress that the car I am driving is essentially a demonstrator. Within a year these same components, designed specifically for automobiles, could be perfected to develop speeds of up to 65 miles an hour with acceleration from zero to 65 miles per hour in 15 seconds. If the funds authorized in my bill were available now, it would be possible to shape these components into a vehicle capable of traveling at 80 miles per hour and accelerating from zero to 60 miles per hour in 10 seconds. The battery in the car would have a life of 3 to 5 years or 75,000 miles and it would be capable of traveling 200 miles on a single charge. Other experimental models perform comparably with other types of battery and there is no question that if both the car and the battery are designed together for optimum performance we can expand the

horizons of the electrical vehicle as far as may be necessary.

The initial cost of electric cars is still a problem. Silver-zinc batteries, giving a range of 100 miles per charge, for example, would cost about $2,230. This is not a serious obstacle however. The most expensive element of the battery—the silver—is totally recoverable at the end of the battery's 3- to 5-year life, so that the true cost is only the cost of production—between $700 and $900—plus the expense of installation. This is true for all the battery types now in use that have expensive components.

With present technology, the consumer could rent these batteries for pennies a day. There are batteries on the horizon that would have longer life, greater power, and are made of common and quite inexpensive elements—the nickel-zinc, zinc-air, or the lithium-air batteries, for example.

The most attractive feature of electric cars is their operating economy. The car I am driving can be completely recharged for about 10 cents at present electric rates. Even greater economies are possible if we develop a production technology.

One barrier has been the creation of a market adequate to support a major automotive innovation. Many financiers and automotive experts still remember only too clearly the experience of Tucker and the rueful remark of Henry Kaiser when his auto effort failed, that although he expected to drop $50 million in the effort, he "didn't expect it to disappear without a ripple."

The more than 330,000 cars and trucks operated by the Federal agencies may offer a unique solution. The vast majority of these are operated in applications for which the electric car is superbly suited. It would be consistent with the President's Executive Order No. 11282 directing all Federal agencies to end air pollution. To require the use of electrics is an appropriate application.

The feasibility, and dramatic economy, of electric trucks for urban postal service has been proven by actual operating experience of the United Parcel Service. UPS has been using electric trucks since they opened their first office in New York in 1930. It takes only two men to maintain the entire fleet of 20 trucks. The batteries have an average life of 5 years and the only service they need is charging at the end of a day's run.

We now have the opportunity to make great strides in the development of transportation methods that will serve the needs of our modern cities and reduce the deadly tide of pollution. We have lagged badly in this development in the past and the only way to close the gap between the potential and the reality is for the Federal Government to enter into a development and demonstration program in cooperation with American industry as my bill provides.

An editorial in today's New York Times presents an excellent summary which I read into the RECORD at this time:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1967]

PROTECTING NEW YORK'S AIR

New York is lucky, a Federal meteorologist told the recent interstate air pollution conference here. Its location next to the ocean and its relatively strong winds permit the city's atmosphere to cleanse itself with unusual ease and speed. Air pollution such as is normal here would make the atmosphere intolerable for human beings if it took place in many other parts of this country.

Even so, the city is threatened by rising clouds of aerial sewage; and already there are times—as last Thanksgiving—when atmospheric inversions and stagnation threaten disaster.

Underlining the seriousness of this situation is the Federal Government report that the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area has the worst sulphur dioxide pollution in the entire country, and an almost equally unenviable status in respect to carbon monoxide pollution.

In addition, as every resident knows, there is an excessive abundance of smoke and soot in the city's air. The cost of trying to cope with the area's atmospheric poisons was put by one witness at about $620 per family annually, or about $3,000,000,000. The damage done to health and comfort is incalculable.

Fortunately the chief culprits responsible for these conditions are identifiable. The role of the automobile and truck as a contributor to air pollution is widely recognized, and the latest testimony only adds to the already overwhelming case for cutting down this source of gaseous garbage. The measures which have begun to be taken to lessen noxious automobile exhaust fumes are, however, grossly inadequate.

Any serious attack on pollution caused by motor vehicles will have to involve a reduction in the number of cars and trucks entering the city, and also in the average annual use of those that are already here. Such drastic measures would have the welcome side effect of speeding up the development and introduction of electric vehicles.

Much of the other air pollution comes from a few large offenders. The United States Public Health Service's tabulation of those who pour sulphur dioxide into the air showed that fewer than 50 major plants account for most of the damage. The worst of these are the public utilities—Consolidated Edison, Jersey Central Power and Light, and Public Service—along with a number of metallurgical, oil and chemical plants in the most noxious region of Northern New Jersey. This concentration of offenders should make it comparatively easy to overcome the problem. A minimum reform would be require that public utilities switch as promptly as possible to oil with maximally low sulphur content and to natural gas.

To clean up this area's fouled air supply will cost a good deal of money, force many people to change their accustomed ways of doing things, and step on the toes of some powerful vested interests. But that is the only way to insure New York's more than ten million people against aerial catastrophe.

Pollution and transportation are problems for the Nation, but crises for our cities. For this reason, and because of the clear reluctance of the transportation establishment to take the lead, I believe Congress should vest the responsibility for future development in the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. From his vantage point—free of commitments to the entrenched interests, but cooperating with industry and drawing upon the resources of all Federal agencies and departments—the Secretary has both the mandate and capability to succeed.

One of the leading scientists in the battery field was explaining to me the other day the ways that inertia and indifference had impeded progress in this area. He attributed this to a reluctance to buck the entrenched interests and to a failure to realize the seriousness of the pollution danger.

In New York, he said, we are not far from the day when people start dropping dead in the streets from our impure and poisonous air. If we wait until then to start, it may be too late.

This Nation needs and can have clean air, but only if we take the initiative today. Congress can, and must, act.

HON. WALTER FRANKLIN HORAN

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] 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. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I rise today to commemorate a devoted American and former colleague in the U.S. House of Representatives—the Honorable Walter Franklin Horan. Certainly the entire country mourns his untimely death, and especially those of us, on both sides of the aisle, who have had the privilege of his experience and guidance in the Halls of Congress.

Walter Horan's life was dedicated to public service. After the outbreak of World War I, he interrupted his high school training to enlist in the U.S. Navy and served his country from April 1917 to November 1919. After his discharge from service, he completed his high school education and subsequently graduated from Washington State College in 1925. Walter Horan was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1942 and ably served the Fifth District of the State of Washington until the 88th Congress in 1964—a total of 22 years in the House.

Walter Horan was a respected Member of the House, and he will long be remembered by his colleagues for his devotion to the principles of the Republican Party as well as his dedication and willingness to serve his constituents and his country. He was diligent, and respected for his views and judgment. As a Member of Congress and as an outstanding American, Walter Horan will be remembered by all who had the privilege of his association.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

WILLIAM A. STEIGER SUPPORTS HOOVER-TYPE COMMISSION

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] 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. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would at this time like to join a number of my colleagues in support of the establishment of a Commission on the Organization of the Executive

Branch of the Government. I have today introduced legislation for that purpose.

We are all aware, Mr. Speaker, of the increasingly more obvious overlapping of governmental programs. We are all aware of the continuing communications gap between officials at all levels of the Federal Government. We are aware of the growing number of forms, reports, directives, and questionnaires that have become commonplace in our Federal Government. And finally, Mr. Speaker, we are all aware and, I am afraid some of us are becoming much more aware, of the delays in the processing by Federal officials of what should be routine applications for Federal assistance by local and State governments.

We are faced with a dual problem of attempting to find the most effective ways of managing the Federal Government while at the same time finding the best ways of funding the needs of our citizens. I hope it is sufficient to say that the tax-sharing concept which proposes to share a portion of the Federal Government's revenue directly with the State and local units of government without strings would be a big step toward solving one part of this problem.

On the other hand, tax sharing must go hand in hand with a Federal Government run on a businesslike basis. Our Federal Government must be run economically and imaginatively. In order to do this effectively, in order to have this kind of government, we must carefully examine the existing structure and make changes which will strengthen the system as well as upgrade it and provide additional economies. Only in this manner will we be able to begin to effectively help reduce the duplication and overlapping that exists and thus revitalize the programs of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we have not had a thorough study of our Federal Government and its functions and structure since the last Hoover Commission in 1953–55. That Commission, and especially the Hoover Commission of 1947–49, accomplished a great deal. It seems to me that a Hoover-type commission to conduct a thorough, impartial review of Federal operations and recommend comprehensive reforms makes a great deal of sense.

It is my pleasure, therefore, to join in support of this important legislation inaugurated by my distinguished colleague from the Sixth District of Maryland, the Honorable CHARLES McC. MATHIAS.

NEW HELP FOR THE RETURNING SERVICEMEN

Mr. MIZE. 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, I am today introducing legislation for consideration by the Congress which would increase the amount of benefits received by the returning servicemen under their cold war GI bill.

I was among the sponsors of the legislation last year which extended the GI bill to the cold war veterans, and at that time I pressed for a base rate of $130 a month. But last year's Congress, famed for its generosity, chose to be anything but generous with these boys to whom we all owe so much. The rate decided upon was only $100 a month.

Although the costs of higher education have skyrocketed in the years since World War II, the amount set as the figure for education benefits was $10 a month less than the World War II veteran received. In the light of increased costs, this $100 a month base rate is insufficient today.

The purpose of the bill which we passed last year was to provide a degree of assistance to these returning servicemen whose careers and educations have been interrupted in the service of their Nation. They return to find their contemporaries 2 and 3 years ahead of them in college and professions. Many return with no skill or education which would suit them for the rapidly changing employment market.

With the aid of the GI bill, many of these young men have entered college or other schools. The contribution the Government makes to this education is little enough gratitude for the services of these men. But the amount of the benefits is unrealistically low, and many veterans who would like to take advantage of the plan find that they are still unable to attend college.

After World War II, when the cost of attending a public college averaged $910 and a private college $1,200, the GI bill provided a base rate of $110 a month for a veteran with no dependents attending school full time. The rate set now for the Vietnam veteran is only $100 a month. Yet the cost of the same education is now $1,640 a year for public college and $2,570 for the average private institution.

The act which provides educational assistance to the orphans of veterans, which was originally based on the amounts of the World War II GI bill, was increased last year to $130 a month in recognition of the higher costs. I propose today that the benefits for the veteran of the cold war be increased equally. Under my bill, the full-time student with no dependents would receive $130 a month, with one dependent $155, and with two or more dependents $180 a month.

To those of us who give every legislative measure a careful weighing for its cost, it is reassuring to look to the benefit-to-cost ratio of the previous GI bills. The $14.5 billion in cost to the Treasury has been more than recouped in additional tax revenue from the young men whose earning power was increased by education. The World War II GI bill continues to pay for itself at the rate of $1 billion a year. Had it not been for this program, shortages of trained men in essential occupations would have plagued the Nation even more seriously. The program raised higher education in this country to new heights, as more serious-minded older students returned to the campuses.

I am hopeful that my colleagues here in the House of Representatives will join me in support of this worthwhile legislation.

GOVERNMENT-PAID TRAVEL FOR SERVICEMEN ON EMERGENCY AND CONVALESCENT LEAVE

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] 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. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide Government-paid transportation for servicemen traveling on emergency or convalescent leave.

Such legislation was recommended during the last Congress by the House Armed Services Committee's Special Subcommittee on Commercial Air Transportation for Service Personnel on which I had the honor to serve under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

During the recent Christmas period, 8,596 Job Corps trainees traveled to and from their homes at Government expense. The cost was about $1 million.

If this Nation can afford to pay the travel expenses of Job Corps trainees on leave, we can certainly do no less than pay the emergency and convalescent leave travel expenses of our military personnel.

My bill would provide Government payment of travel expenses for a serviceman who is granted leave because of the existence of an unexpected family emergency, such as death or critical illness of a parent, wife, or child. In addition, it would provide for Government-paid travel for military personnel on convalescent leave during their recovery from wounds or illness incurred in a combat area.

The travel and transportation allowances would cover reasonable travel to and from a serviceman's duty station or place of medical treatment. I urge the support of my colleagues for this measure.

SPUTNIK MAGAZINE: RECIPROCITY NEEDED

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] 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. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, once again the administration apparently was surprised by the bold aggressiveness of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. I am referring to the successful entry into the United States last week by the Communist magazine Sputnik.

I am also referring to the lethargy of the Department of State which, prior to the entry of Sputnik, apparently failed

to obtain reciprocal distribution in the U.S.S.R. for a similar publication which contains thoughts and ideas generated within the free world.

I am also speaking of the failure of the administration to increase U.S. exports of magazines, newspapers, and other publications and communication media to the U.S.S.R. and Eastern European Communist nations.

On October 31, 1966, I wrote the Secretary of State and raised questions concerning reciprocity in the distribution of publications between the United States and the U.S.S.R. Here, in part, is the Department's reply of November 17, 1966:

> Such a subscription would be impossible as a result of the Soviet policy of restricting the flow of information into the USSR. In fact, it is highly unlikely that the average member of the CPSU [Communist Party Soviet Union] could subscribe to a non-Communist foreign newspaper. . . . There are no restrictions on subscriptions by American citizens to *Pravda* or other Soviet newspapers. . . . However, this disparity springs from the difference between our open society and the closed society of the USSR and is not in any way susceptible to negotiations.

Notice the Department of State said this disparity "is not in any way susceptible to negotiations."

On January 6, 1967, when I learned of Sputnik—which translates as fellow traveler—and of its imminent distribution in the United States, I again wrote the Secretary of State and asked two questions:

> 1. Is each copy clearly identified as "Communist Propaganda"?
>
> 2. Did the United States Department of State proffer any agreement to the Soviet Union for the purpose of obtaining reciprocal rights to export to the U.S.S.R. a similar magazine, for example, a Russian language edition of *Reader's Digest?*

Also, I stated the need for "specific plans and positive action for winning the competition in ideas."

Even though the Department has now made public statements concerning Sputnik, I have as yet received no reply to my January 6 letter, the text of which appears at the close of my remarks.

Sputnik is a digest of the Soviet press. What type of Communist literature could the administration expect Sputnik to offer in the coming months and years? On January 8, 1967, as the first issue of Sputnik was being distributed to the newsstands of America, the Communist Party Central Committee was broadcasting to the Russian people the instructions the Soviet press will follow during this, the 50th anniversary year of Communist control of Russia. The Russian language broadcast of January 8 directs that the entire Soviet press—entirely Communist controlled—and every publishing organization—entirely Communist controlled—and every person associated with Soviet publishing—entirely Communist controlled—"will devote special attention to: preparations for publishing scientific and popular-historical, social-economic, political, and military literature, fiction and children's books which should be written by old Bolsheviks, veterans of the revolution, the civil and great patriotic wars, heroes of labor, and distinguished scientists and public figures, maintaining a high ideological and artistic level of the publications."

Approximately 1 week after my letter of January 6, 1967, to the Secretary of State, the Department apparently finally reacted in some fashion. From news stories of January 14, I learned that belatedly the Department asked the Soviets for reciprocity after the magazine had arrived on the American newsstands.

Once again Americans have reason to question the administration's policies which it calls "building bridges" to the Communists.

This increased flow of traffic in ideas is primarily one way. Why?

From this Sputnik episode it would appear that this administration is not capable of keeping up with the activities of the agencies of the Communist Soviet Government which are directly involved with distributing propaganda in the United States.

The administration should have known that Sputnik was gaining entry into our country. It knew of the two Soviet Communist agencies which are immediately involved in promoting the distribution of the magazine.

In the November 17, 1966, letter to me, to which I referred above, the Department of State confirmed that Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga is the Soviet agency located in the Soviet Union which handles the "exports of books, recordings, newspapers, magazines, and similar items." And, according to news stories, the Soviet Communist agency located in the United States which handles the distribution of Sputnik is registered with the U.S. Department of Justice under the name Eastern News Distributors. It is reportedly located at 155 West 15th Street, New York City.

The administration must promote the export of American publications to the citizens of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Once again I say: "all of our publishers and broadcasters of every political hue will be happy to tap that market which is so starving for ideas."

American parents in my opinion are not anxiously waiting to buy a digest of Soviet publications, which, among other things, will contain children's stories written by old Bolsheviks containing a high Communist ideological content. On the other hand there is ample evidence to prove that Soviet citizens have been waiting almost 50 years for opinions and judgments that are other than Communist.

The text of my January 6, 1967, letter to the Secretary of State follows:

JANUARY 6, 1967.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: News stories this week tell of a new Soviet magazine called *Sputnik*. It carries articles which have appeared previously in Soviet publications. Reportedly, 12,000 English language copies of the magazine's first edition, the January 1967 issue, are being distributed in the United States and circulation is expected to reach 50,000 before the year is out.

It is my understanding that in the Soviet Union the agency, GLAVLIT, reviews all printed matter of every kind and in so doing it performs pre-publication and post-publication censorship. I also understand that no publication may be exported and no publication may be imported without the permission of GLAVLIT. The need for GLAVLIT is, of course, clear. In the words of the Communist Party's theoretical journal, *Kommunist*, "The strength of our press lies in its idea content, its loyalty to the all conquering teaching of Marxism-Leninism . . ."

In the light of the above it would appear that the magazine *Sputnik*, as all material printed in the Soviet Union, is definitely a vehicle for disseminating Communist Party propaganda.

If the magazine *Sputnik* is now being imported into the U.S. two questions immediately arise:

1. Is each copy clearly identified as "Communist Propaganda"?

2. Did the United States Department of State proffer any agreement to the Soviet Union for the purpose of obtaining reciprocal rights to export to the U.S.S.R. a similar magazine, for example, a Russian language edition of Reader's Digest?

On October 12, 1966 you made an address entitled, "Requirements for Organizing the Peace." In your remarks you brought out the fact that economic production is growing more rapidly in the Free World than in Communist states. Then you went on to say:

"Even more important, communism is losing the competition in ideas."

It is my conviction that in any equitable competition between ideas generated by a free society and ideas generated by the Soviet Communist society that the latter would be defeated overwhelmingly. The key word, however, is "equitable". Within any society the opportunity for a victory of Free World ideas over Communist ideology is greatly diminished if rules are stacked against the Free World such that there is no equitable competition.

And in the Soviet Union the Communist Party destroyed the competition in ideas almost 50 years ago. I believe the records show that on November 9, 1917, two days after the Bolsheviks seized power, Lenin suppressed all non-Communist publications. Reportedly, Lenin stated at that time that the "press is one of the most powerful weapons" which is "not less dangerous than bombs and machine guns."

Mr. Khrushchev has said:

"We do not have a stronger, more effective instrument than our own press. The press is the best long-range weapon of our Party. We can if we select our newspaper articles well, hit the mark thousands of kilometers away . . ."

From what I can determine the present ruler of the U.S.S.R., Mr. Brezhnev, does not differ with the policy and statements of Lenin and Khrushchev as regards the usefulness of the printed word in advancing the cause of Communism. On May 5, 1966 *Pravda* used these words, ". . . the Soviet press—the mighty ideological weapon of the party, the collective propagandist, agitator and organizer. Our truly popular press, guarding and multiplying militant Bolshevik traditions, loyally serves the Communist Party . . ."

A requirement for organizing the peace should include specific plans and positive action for winning the competition in ideas. It would seem that meaningful efforts to establish equitable competition in ideas between the Free World and the world of the Bolsheviks are long overdue and that for the advancement of U.S. national interests such efforts are mandatory.

I invite your comments to the above.

Sincerely yours,

GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
Member of Congress.

BILL TO REVIEW GREAT SOCIETY PROGRAMS

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] 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. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress soon will be asked to dig deeper than ever before into the pockets of the American taxpayer to finance the costs of operating our great Nation.

The President says he will ask Congress to add 6 percent to the income tax of most of the Nation's wage earners and all corporations. He also wants to further bloat the national debt.

Our economy is the most viable in the history of the world. There is no doubt in my mind that we can shoulder both the cost of the war in Vietnam and a reasonable level of nondefense spending. We can afford both guns and a moderate amount of butter.

Mr. Johnson would have us believe that he is in a mood to economize. Unfortunately, in his public utterances he seems more inclined to cut away the lean than the fat. He deals in items like the deferment of vital flood-control projects and the much-needed Interstate Highway program—calculated, no doubt, to provide surface evidence that he is cutting Federal expenditures, but unfortunately this only adds to the ultimate costs.

It appears that it will be up to Congress to do the real pruning. Today I am introducing a bill which will enable us to evaluate our myriad of social problems and then cut out duplications, eliminate ill-conceived programs and improve good ones.

The bill would establish a Commission for the Organization and Administration of Federal Social Programs.

Generally, the bill provides for a 16-member Commission, headed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower and President Harry S. Truman, and with the remaining membership made up of State Governors, U.S. Senators, Members of Congress, representatives of the executive branch, and persons from private life.

The Commission and its professional staff would give the Congress a preliminary report on its findings in 6 months, and again at the end of its 1-year lifetime. Recommendations for reforms would be made to provide the groundwork for legislative and administrative remedies.

Most of the attention of this Commission would be directed to recently spawned and sometimes ill-conceived programs of the war on poverty. But its scope would include all of the Federal programs concerned with social problems.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the administration of the war on poverty is in such disrepute today that the American people would support congressional action to abolish these programs and start fresh.

But this would destroy the good along with the bad. A commission, created in the spirit of the Hoover Commission and chaired by Presidents Eisenhower and Truman, can give us a positive means of redirecting the war on poverty and other social programs.

Enactment of this bill would establish such a commission.

THE SOUTH-WEST AFRICA MANDATE

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] 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. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the decision by the International Court of Justice on July 18, 1966, that it would not make a judgment on the merits in the South-West Africa case will be remembered as an unfortunate setback for those who have counseled restraint and moderation in dealing with apartheid in South-West Africa.

Perhaps the most significant result of this decision is that it may cast doubt in the minds of many Africans about the efficacy of the rule of law and the concept of peaceful settlement of disputes.

In a statement issued on August 3, 1966, by six colleagues and myself, we wrote that—

> Only U.S. leadership now will convince the African states of the sincerity of U.S. concern for the future of nondiscriminatory development and nonviolent transition in Africa.

At the same time, we recommended that the President pursue certain actions toward this goal.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Thomas Patrick Melady, president of the Africa Service Institute, has written a clear and perceptive article giving the background of the South-West Africa mandate and details on current discussions in the United Nations. Dr. Melady's article, which appeared in America on November 12, 1966, thoughtfully concludes that—

> In the South-West Africa case, the conscience of mankind has a clear opportunity to speak out on a basic moral issue.

In my judgment, Members will find Dr. Melady's article of interest in following the background and implications of the July decision, and under unanimous consent I place it in the RECORD at this point:

THE SOUTH-WEST AFRICA MANDATE

(NOTE.—A question of international and racial justice that goes back to the League of Nations has now provoked fresh controversy in the United Nations. Here is the clearly detailed background of the whole complex story.)

(By Thomas Patrick Melady)

On July 18, the International Court of Justice in The Hague announced it would not make a judgment on the merits of the South-West Africa case, brought six years ago by Ethiopia and Liberia against the Republic of South Africa because of its virtual incorporation of the mandated territory of South-West Africa. The court dismissed the case on the grounds that Ethiopia and Liberia had no "legal right or interest regarding the subject matter of their claims."

Afro-Asians concerned about this matter had been asked by their Western friends to be "reasonable" in their approach to South Africa, and to use the peaceful means of solving it offered by the International Court. On the other hand, they had been urged by the Communist states not to waste time with the court but rather to pursue their goal through political and subversive activities. The Afro-Asians took the West's advice and went to the court. But after six years of litigation, the court dismissed the case, 8 votes to 7, without passing judgment on its merits. It seemed as though the Republic of South Africa could continue to apply its policy of apartheid to the South-West Africans indefinitely.

On October 27, however, a fresh move by Afro-Asians in the United Nations significantly changed the picture. A situation that threatened to heighten racial tensions and fan the flames of anti-Western sentiment throughout the Afro-Asian world now gives promise of a more hopeful outcome. The resolution passed that day, depriving South Africa of its mandate, may mark the beginning of the end of a long story of racial injustice.

Originally annexed by Germany in 1884, South-West Africa was captured by South African forces during World War I, which was fought under two slogans: "The War to End War" and "No Annexation and No Indemnities." In Versailles, attempts were made to put these slogans into practice. Hence the creation of the League of Nations for the peaceful settlement of international disputes: the League adopted the mandate system to replace the practice of annexation of colonies by the victors. These territories were to be held in trust, as Gen. Jan Christian Smuts had recommended, in 1918, in his booklet *League of Nations, a Practical System*. "The mandatory state," he there wrote, "should look upon its position as a great trust and honor, not as an office of profit or a position of private advantage for it or its nationals."

Despite these altruistic aims, Gen. Louis Botha, South Africa's Prime Minister, sought after the war the outright annexation of South-West Africa; but President Wilson would have none of this. Instead, a compromise was reached whereby South-West Africa was given as a mandate "to His Britannic Majesty to be exercised on his behalf by the King's Ministers in South Africa." It was classified as a C mandate because of its geographical and economic contiguity with South Africa; furthermore, under Germany it had been a serious threat to the latter's security. Article 2 of the mandate stated:

"The mandatory shall have full power of administration and legislation over the territory subject to the present mandate as an integral portion of his territory. The mandatory shall promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the territory subject to the present mandate."

In other words, South Africa's control of the territory was limited by the provision that its policies had to promote the "material and moral well-being and the social progress" of the inhabitants. Another limiting provision was that it had to submit annual reports to the Permanent Mandates Commission. This second limitation, however, proved useless in practice, because to censure South Africa or deprive it of the mandate, all the League members had to vote unanimously. This never happened. Thus South-West Africa was virtually annexed.

In 1946, Gen. Smuts sought from the United Nations formal recognition of incorporation. But unlike the League Council, the United Nations General Assembly contained a number of non-European states increasingly concerned, during the sweep of

nationalism in Africa and Asia, with the welfare of their peoples. Not surprisingly, Smuts' request was rejected; instead, the General Assembly voted to include South-West Africa in its trusteeship scheme and called on South Africa to submit annual reports. But in 1947, South Africa rejected the UN proposal, arguing that the UN Charter did not oblige member states to transfer territories mandated to them by the League. The League having died without a legal successor, South Africa would continue to administer the territory "in the spirit of the mandate," but would submit reports to the UN merely because the latter was the spiritual successor of the League. In effect, this statement meant that South Africa wanted to maintain the status quo: it would not surrender South-West Africa nor would it formally annex it.

But from 1949 on, the new Nationalist Government of Dr. Malan took an uncompromising line. To speed up incorporation, it provided for the representation of South-West Africa in the South African Parliament and stopped submitting reports to the UN on the grounds that the mandate had lapsed with the League and that the UN was not its automatic legal successor. Meanwhile, since their spokesmen had been refused travel documents, the Herero people, who feard incorporation, asked a clergyman, Michael Scott, to represent them at the UN.

Partly as a result of his petitions, the General Assembly in 1949 asked the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion because South Africa was challenging UN authority over the mandated territory. In 1950, the court advised 1) that South Africa continue to have international obligations in terms of the League mandate, 2) that the UN Charter provisions for trusteeship were applicable to South-West Africa, but 3) that they imposed no legal obligation on South Africa to place the territory under the UN and 4) that South Africa alone could not legally modify the status of the territory, UN consent being necessary.

Point 3, the kernel of the case, which was passed by 8 votes to 6, meant that South Africa had merely a moral, not a legal, obligation to submit the territory to UN authority. South Africa did not feel this moral obligation. Instead, it went ahead with plans to bring South-West Africa more into line with its own policies. Thus, in 1954 it passed the South-West Africa Native Affairs Administration Act, which placed the Africans under the control of the Department of Native Affairs in Pretoria and made them subject to the pass laws.

While denying the United Nations' authority, South Africa agreed to negotiate with an ad hoc committee of the General Assembly to arrive at a settlement. Consisting of five members, among them the United States, this committee was to see to the implementation of the 1950 opinion of the court. South Africa proposed to reassume its international obligations under the League mandate by negotiating a new agreement with the three remaining members of the principal allied and associated powers of World War I: Great Britain, the United States and France. It would then be directly responsible to them, but the UN would be asked to give final confirmation to the agreement.

The ad hoc committee rejected this proposal, because it did not allow for the full implementation of the court's opinion, especially that portion dealing with supervision of South-West Africa by the UN and submission of annual reports.

There was thus a major difference of opinion between South Africa and the United Nations. This reflected itself in the General Assembly's continuing interest in the South-West Africa question and in South Africa's steadfast opposition. Because of this impasse, the International Court was twice asked for advisory opinions, in 1955 and 1956. In the June, 1956 opinion, the court held that the UN committee on South-West Africa had the legal power to grant oral hearings to petitioners if such hearings were necessary for the international supervision of the territory, even though the League mandate had made no reference to them. But such hearings did not enlarge the scope of international supervision. This opinion opened the way for further hearings and petitions from individuals and organizations in South-West Africa.

Apart from recourse to the court, another attempt at breaking the impasse between the UN and South Africa was the creation in 1957 of a UN Good Offices Committee, consisting of Britain, Brazil and the United States. The committee's task was to find a basis for an agreement that would safeguard South-West Africa's international status. It visited South Africa in 1958 for talks with South African officials. The latter stuck to the same position they had held before the ad hoc committee, namely, that South Africa would agree only to the League mandate and that the UN was unacceptable as the second party to any agreement. There were also hints that South Africa would be willing to consider partitioning the territory; the southern part would then be annexed and the northern administered by South Africa as trustee.

In 1959, when the committee again tried to start negotiations, South Africa would not budge from its standpoint. To the General Assembly, the South African proposals were equally unacceptable, for they aimed at evading direct UN supervision. South Africa knew that once it acceded to supervision, its control over South-West Africa would end; for the UN, unlike the League, took a strong anticolonialist line. Once again there was a deadlock.

From capitals outside the West came advice to South-West Africans that their future lay neither in the UN, which was a product of Western intrigue, nor in the International Court of Justice, which, they said, interpreted laws to the advantage of colonialists. Both bodies, they alleged, were organs of reaction and the status quo, forces hostile to the African revolution. From the Bureau of African Affairs in Accra emanated similar sentiments—though these urged the Africans to rely on themselves alone. Indeed, this theme had pervaded the discussions of the All-African Peoples Conference in Accra, in December, 1958.

Other counsels prevailed, however, and it was decided that the court should once again be asked to pass judgment. When lawyers came up with the idea of presenting the case as a complaint by two former members of the League, Ethiopia and Liberia, it was hailed as a brilliant stratagem against recalcitrant South Africa, because not the UN but two fellow members of the League were accusing it of implementing policies contrary to its mandate.

Ethiopia and Liberia hopefully filed suit in 1960, with the overwhelming support of the Afro-Asian peoples and with encouragement from sympathetic people and governments in the West. Immediately, South Africa questioned the court's jurisdiction, but lost in 1962 by 8 votes to 7. In its judgment, the court ruled not only that it had jurisdiction, but also that the plaintiffs had the legal qualification to bring suit.

From 1963 to 1965, the court heard arguments and evidence—both oral and written—on the merits of the case, that is, on the policies South Africa was pursuing in South-West Africa. The Africans' position, briefly, was that apartheid or separate development was designed to perpetuate inferiority; to this South Africa responded by saying that that policy was the best for all the inhabitants.

Then, last July, the court decided that the plaintiffs, after all, had no "legal right or interest regarding the subject matter of their claims." To the layman's way of thinking, the court had reversed its 1962 decision that the plaintiffs could file suit.

Although, at the time, Prime Minister Hendrik Verwoerd, in a radio speech, called the decision a major victory for South Africa, strictly speaking it was not. What it meant was that for the time being South Africa could keep on extending apartheid without feeling any uncertainty about the legality of its position. But the court, no matter how unpalatable its decision was, had not blessed apartheid.

Three groups reached most strongly against the court's refusal to pass judgment. The Afro-Asians unanimously condemned it, for they saw the extending of apartheid as a serious offense against decent civilization. For the African states, the decision was a bitter blow; they had regarded this case as vital for the liberation of southern Africa. (In the UN, South Africa has blocked international action by arguing from the Charter that the policy of apartheid falls squarely within its own domestic jurisdiction. This argument has all along thwarted legal-minded critics; for those opposed to apartheid but reluctant to act, it has been a convenient legal shield for inaction. But it does not hold for South-West Africa, for South Africa has a mandate to exercise on behalf of the international community for the inhabitants' welfare. Since in this case morality and law coincided, the Africans' hopes were high.)

A second group that was disappointed by the court's decision was the smaller Western and Latin American states. These states have favored taking international conflicts to the International Court of Justice; they felt they could expect fairer decisions at the hands of the court than at the hands of the major powers. Although not direct participants in the proceeding, the major Western powers, too, were keenly interested. With the dismissal of the South-West Africa case, they felt the opportunity to resolve an important international issue in a judicial manner had been lost.

The third group disappointed with these developments is the educational, religious and legal communities. Scholars, religious leaders and legal experts have all supported the court, for they believe that greater use of it to resolve major international problems would lessen the chance of violence.

In African eyes, the court's decision put an end to whatever chances there were of a legal solution. Nationalist groups in disillusionment issued a call to arms. Communist states invited South-West African nationalists to attend military training camps behind the Iron Curtain. But once more the Africans resisted the temptation to seek a violent solution to the problem. They turned to political action in the United Nations.

On October 27, the General Assembly adopted, by a vote of 114 to 2 (with 3 abstentions), a resolution sponsored by 54 African and Asian states, with an amendment supported by 21 Latin American states, declaring that South-West Africa "comes under the direct responsibility of the United Nations," and creating a committee of 14 states to recommend "practical ways by which South-West Africa should be administered to lead its people to ultimate independence." The committee is to report in April, 1967.

The member states represented on the committee are: United Arab Republic, Nigeria, Senegal, Ethiopia, Japan, Pakistan, Italy, Finland, Canada, Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Chile, Mexico and the U.S.A.

The Security Council will be responsible for enforcing the resolution. Two members of the Council, however, Britain and France, were among the nations that abstained from voting. Moreover, South Africa contests the UN's right to rescind the League of Nations' mandate unilaterally. It has promised to resist any attempt to enforce the resolution.

There is little doubt that the step taken

by the General Assembly is a far-reaching one. What it will lead to, no one can say. Everything now depends upon the co-operation of the Western powers. The West must come to understand that the Afro-Asian peoples have a driving determination to eliminate racial oppression in all its forms. Pope Paul and other religious leaders, both Christian and Jewish, have increasingly noted the grave injustice of racism. In the South-West Africa case, the conscience of mankind has a clear opportunity to speak out on a basic moral issue.

[THOMAS PATRICK MELADY is president of the Africa Service Institute. His most recent book, *Revolution of Color*, was published by Hawthorn.]

SHARING FEDERAL REVENUES

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] 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. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill designed to return to the States—and through them to local governments—a portion of Federal revenues with a minimum of restrictions on their use. The distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and a number of other Senators are cosponsoring this legislation in the Senate today.

This bill is a modified version of the tax-sharing legislation Senator JAVITS and I introduced in 1965. Among the other sponsors in the House during the last Congress was my former colleague from Kansas, Bob Ellsworth. At his initiative, we wrote to Governors, State and local officials, and members of the academic community throughout the country to get their thoughts and suggestions on this proposal. One leading economist replied:

> What is important, I fully agree with you, is to use the tax collecting powers of the Federal Government to help the states carry out their health, education, and welfare missions which are now, in many areas, sadly underfinanced.

In addition, a revenue-sharing proposal was endorsed by the national Governors' conference last year.

The new measure would return to the States 1 percent of the aggregate taxable income reported on individual income tax returns in the first calendar year. One and a half percent would be returned to the States in the second year and 2 percent thereafter. On the basis of 1966 figures, about $3 billion would be returned to the States during the first year.

Under the bill, 85 percent of the tax-sharing fund would be returned to the States on the basis of population. The remaining 15 percent would be distributed among the States with per capita income figures below the average State per capita income. This means that New York, for example, would receive $256.3 million while Kentucky, with a per capita income of $544 below the average State figure, would receive a basic allotment of $37.2 million plus an additional $25 million.

Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Government and State and local governments are to strengthen the partnership that President Johnson cited as a goal in his state of the Union message, the financial resources of the other levels of government must be substantially increased. A genuine partnership will require considerably more than the administrative restructuring and effective planning to which the President referred in his message. It will require large sums of money—to supplement State taxing powers that are now being used to their fullest extent—available through a well-designed program of Federal-State revenue sharing.

The need for more financial asistance to the States is clear: the total debt outstanding for State and local governments in the past decade increased 125 percent while the Federal debt increased only 14 percent. At the same time, State and local taxes has risen about as high as they can go with the increase in revenue at these levels from $23.6 billion in 1955 to $51.6 billion in 1965. However, additional aid from the Federal Government should come in the form of a share of Federal tax revenues with a minimum of restrictions—rather than as an increasing number of grant-in-aid programs with the accompanying Federal presence in the decision-making process at the State and local levels.

One of the principal features of the Javits-Reed tax-sharing plan is the relative freedom the States and municipalities will enjoy in the use of these funds. A State allotment may be used for programs, projects, and services—including capital expenditures—in the general areas of health, education, and welfare. In addition, each State may use up to 5 percent of its allotment to provide for planning, research, and development in the modernization of the institutions of State government and the improvement of governmental procedures. Funds may not be used, however, for administrative expenses for State and local governments, highway programs, State payments in lieu of property taxes, debt service, and disaster relief.

To insure that States will share their allotments equitably with local governments, the Governor of each State will be required to submit a distribution plan at the beginning of each fiscal year, following consultations with local officials. The plan would detail how the State proposed to share its funds with local governments.

The primary features of the tax-sharing plan are:

First. A trust fund would be established in the Treasury Department into which an amount equaling 1 percent of the aggregate taxable income reported on individual income tax returns would be appropriated starting on July 1, 1968. The fund would increase to 1½ percent of aggregate taxable income starting July 1, 1969, and to 2 percent of aggregate taxable income starting July 1, 1970, and thereafter. Using current data this would total $3 billion. It would grow as the fund increased and as the tax base expanded.

Second. Payments to the States from the trust fund would be made on the basis of the following formula: 85 percent would be distributed on the basis of population. This amount would be increased or decreased depending on a State's own tax effort relative to that of other States, which would be measured by a "revenue effort ratio" for each State. This is obtained by dividing the total revenues collected by the State and its political subdivisions by the total income of individuals residing in the State. The State's revenue effort ratio is then compared to the average ratio for all States by dividing the State's ratio by the average; 15 percent would be distributed to those States with per capita personal incomes below the average for all the States. The per capita income for each of these States is subtracted from the average of all States. The difference between these figures is then used to compute each State's share of the fund.

Third. No State could receive a total payment for any one fiscal year in excess of 12 percent of the trust fund for that year.

Fourth. To participate in the plan, a State will be required to file reports with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General, and the appropriate committees of Congress, including a statement of intent as to how and for what purposes it shall spend the money. States would also have to comply with all applicable laws including title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Secretary of the Treasury will be required to file with the Congress an annual audit report on the operation of the fund during the preceding fiscal year and its expected operation in the next year.

Fifth. Appropriations Committees of both Houses and the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee would be required at least once each Congress to conduct a complete survey of the operation of the trust fund and provide such legislative recommendations as may be appropriate.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM CUTBACK PROTEST

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] 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. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week I was privileged to attend a meeting in New Rochelle, N.Y., to protest the cutback in funds for the community action program in New Rochelle.

The meeting was attended by about 500 persons, and city and Federal officials, as well as representatives of civic organizations, spoke out in opposition to the reduction in funds for New Rochelle's most successful antipoverty effort.

Mr. Speaker, the decrease in funds affects every city in our country that has devoted time, energy, and money to setting up a community action program. But more important, in my judgment, is the fact that any cutback in funds breaks faith with the youth of the

ghetto, with the child in need of head-start, with the elderly person seeking some measure of security for his later years, with the mother who is able to take a part-time job and leave her child in a day-care center, with the father who is finally able to find steady employment.

The Economic Opportunity Act represents our commitment as a nation to all of the Nation's disadvantaged—but especially to its youth—and we cannot let these young people sink back into hopelessness and despair because funds are needed for the war in Vietnam. In the case of New Rochelle, this curb in funds could mean the end of a youth program involving some 350 young men and women, age 13 to 18, after only 3 months of operation. It is particularly hard and unfortunate to cut in mid-passage a program of this character that contains a commitment and holds so much promise.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members will be interested in reading about the views expressed at the protest meeting in New Rochelle, and I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New Rochelle Standard-Star of January 12, 1967, describing the meeting, be included in the RECORD.

FIVE HUNDRED PROTEST CAP CUTS—MARCH ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ASKED

(By Eleanor Wehle)

A large roster of local, state and national luminaries gathered on the stage of the Mayflower School auditorium last night to lead about 500 persons in protesting the recent cutback of funds for the anti-poverty programs. Chaired by Mrs. Lila Carol, head of the New Rochelle Community Action Program Committee, the meeting included talks by Robert Mangum, northeast regional director of OEO, Congressman Ogden Reid, Mayor Alvin Ruskin, Leslie A. Roberts, cochairman of the protest meeting, Theodore Cobb of the National Urban League, and others.

The most dramatic plea of the evening was made by Mr. Mangum who said, in effect, "Don't picket my office, picket the President and Congress." Describing the frustrations and discouragements with which he and his staff are daily faced, the OEO director said, "We take the brunt of what happens when politicians make decisions. The people on my staff came into OEO because they believed the government was sincere about reaching out and doing something about the poor in this country."

Many of his workers are resigning, Mr. Mangum stated, "because they went out into the communities and encouraged them to start these programs. Now they just can't go back and face the people and tell them the programs have to be eliminated."

The speaker drew enthusiastic applause when he said, "It is hard for me to send my son to Vietnam when my relatives in the South can't work." Advising the audience to make its protests to Congress and the President "loud and clear," Mr. Mangum added, "There are some congressmen who don't agree that the poor should have something to say."

Making it clear that he was not one of these, Mr. Reid expressed disappointment that the President, in his State of the Union message, hadn't once referred to the Great Society.

"Here in Westchester," Mr. Reid said "we still have ghettoes. We still have need for programs for youth and job training and housing. Now is the test of whether we have the staying power," he added. "This is a sacred trust and the hope of America. Whatever happens in Vietnam we must not let the young men and women of America be short changed because of a war!"

Promises of support in the Senate came from Senator Robert F. Kennedy, expressed by Timothy Hogan, an assistant to the senator, and in a telegram from Sen. Jacob K. Javits.

Mayor Ruskin spoke of the fact that New Rochelle had been one of the first cities to get started with an anti-poverty program. "We have a message for you to take back to Washington," he said. "Two years ago the people were given hope where there was despair, courage where there was fear." Paraphrasing a part of the President's State of the Union message he concluded, "New Rochelle does not lack the will to see its work through."

Mr. Cobb brought the support of the Urban League to the scene and presented some figures to emphasize that the cuts, which he said "are more in the nature of amputations" are nationwide and extremely drastic. To attempt to operate the present programs at the cutback level, he said would be "disastrous." Even if the cuts were restored, they would still not be enough, he added. "We have been serving less than 15 per cent of the people who lag behind the financial curtain."

The Urban League speaker compared the situation to a patient on an operating table, preparing to undergo delicate brain surgery and having the doctor suddenly called away.

When the meeting was thrown open to the audience, Rabbi David Golvensky was among those who spoke, saying, "I want to point out how much it is going to impoverish those of us on the other side of the tracks. We felt our taxes were being well spent, we could see wonderful creative work—not only wars over there but battles over here, battles to build a better tomorrow for all America. We, the privileged people, will be robbed if CAP is scrapped."

Mrs. Harold Edelstein, president of the New Rochelle League of Women Voters, read a statement by the league expressing its endorsement and backing of the CAP programs in this city.

A large contingent of young people was present and three of them Bernice Rogers, Robert Sheldon and Vince Bartee, expressed their ardent desire to keep the Comprehensive Youth Program going.

Napoleon Holmes, administrator of St. Catherine's Community Center, drew the loudest applause of the evening when he pointed out the alleged discriminatory employment practices at the Macy's construction site and named the bricklayers and electricians unions as being opposed to Negro membership. "This is something our own city officials can do something about," he said.

At the close of the meeting Leslie Roberts presented a resolution that "all members of this community, rich and poor, black and white, join together to raise the issue in the places where the power lies, and that the entire citizenry of New Rochelle organize a cavalcade on Washington to clearly demonstrate our dismay and frustration." The resolution was passed unanimously.

Among those on the platform who were introduced at the beginning of the meeting were Councilmen Robert McGrath, Joseph Evans and Hugh Doyle; Alexander Miller of the Human Rights Commission; James K. Bishop, president of the Board of Education; Sol Lesser, representative to the New York OEO; Mrs. Pauline Flippin, executive director of CAP; and Samson Gordon vice chairman of CAPC.

ST. PETERSBURG JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS LOWERING OF VOTING AGE TO 18

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] 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. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for the benefit of the Members of this body a resolution adopted by the Student Senate of the St. Petersburg Campus of the St. Petersburg Junior College supporting the lowering of the voting age to 18.

At the request of the Student Government Association, I am herewith inserting the resolution adopted by the Student Senate of the St. Petersburg Junior College Student Government Association into the RECORD. The resolution follows:

Whereas: The eighteen year old is in the process of attaining or has attained an education,

Whereas: Much of this education is concerned wtih topics such as history, current events, political science, and sociology, which relate directly or indirectly to government,

Whereas: An informed electorate is essential to the success of a representative democracy, and

Whereas: An eighteen year old is assumed to be mature enough to fight for, and if need be, die for his country's freedom,

Therefore be it resolved that: We, the Student Government Association of the St. Petersburg Campus of St. Petersburg Junior College do hereby give our full support to the lowering of the voting age to 18 in order to give our younger citizens a voice in their government through the priceless right of suffrage.

THE CONSERVATION OF OUR HERITAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest, if not the very best, speeches I have ever read on our American heritage was given by Miss Ella V. Ross, dean of students at East Tennessee State University, to the Sarah Hawkins chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution last November 29.

I congratulate my good friend, Dean Ross, on her inspiring remarks, and I am extremely proud to have her words read throughout the land by inserting her speech here:

In the course of my life a number of things have happened to me which have made me very happy, but I say to you simply and honestly today that nothing which has occurred has made me so proud as the fact that I was privileged to have the father and mother whom nature allotted me.

It is not that they had much financial help to give us. On the contrary, there are days I remember from my childhood when money was almost nonexistent; when we were forced to weigh carefully the relative merits of our needs to see which were really essential.

Nor am I proud of them because of their educational attainments. They grew up in Patrick County, Virginia, after the Civil War and you will recall that the only education possible at that time was through "Subscription Schools." When the harvest was enough to make it possible, my grandfather, and yours, probably, would bring in a teacher for a few weeks.

But my father and mother gave me some-

thing much more valuable than anything that money could have bought for me or that formal education could have made possible. They gave me a birthright. The great philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson, once said, "Man is a vehicle in which all his ancestors ride." If that is the case, I take very great pride in the type of ancestors that ride in me.

I hasten, at this point, to make it clear that I am not boasting. One boasts when he brags about his possessions before others who are not equally blessed. Every one of you listening today, I am sure, has an equal right to everything in which I take pride. We are all Americans! We hold our ancestors in common. We have a common background. Our heritage is the same.

And just what is that heritage? I believe I can explain my meaning best by saying that, among other things, it is composed of three characteristics which made our forefathers the individuals they were, and, in turn, our nation the greatest nation the world has ever known. Certainly these three would stand out in any history of our people: (1) *Faith In Their God,* (2) *Faith In Themselves,* and (3) *Belief In Their Country.*

I. FAITH IN THEIR GOD

In his book, *Jews, God and History,* Max Dimont points out that from a purely socio-economic point of view the nation of Israel should not even be in existence. He traces the rise and fall of the nations that had arisen to greatness both before and after the Hebrews and shows that according to all laws this unique people should not have been heard of after the Babylonian Captivity. Then he gives the reason for 20th century Israel, citing Deuteronomy 6:4–9. Pass the knowledge that the Jews are a nation *under God* on to all generations.

We started out in our nation with this same belief. Our Declaration of Independence contains these words: "Men are endowed, (not by their government but) by *their Creator,* with certain inalienable rights." When we began minting our own coins we put on each one, "In God We Trust."

Moreover, our ancestors followed the commandments Moses gave to his followers by "teaching them diligently unto their children." Have you examined the old *Blue Back Speller* and the *McGuffey's Readers* lately? I have several on display and am struck with the fact of the references to our religious and moral heritage. In the Fifth Reader alone, 63 of the 235 lessons have a religious overtone and many more have a moral background.

And what are we teaching today? I examined six (6) fifth grade readers before I found anything that I could class as having a religious or moral overtone. Finally, in *Stories to Remember,* Lyons and Carnahan, I found the selection, "Independence Day." Judge Hood is explaining to a group of children what the Declaration of Independence includes. May I read his explanation of this second part:

"They are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"Many colonists had come to America because they felt that all human beings have, or are endowed with, certain rights. They knew that unalienable rights are those which no one should ever be allowed to take away from a human being. They believed that their lives were their own, to be lived according to individual choice so long as no harm was done. They believed that every individual should be permitted to seek happiness in the work of his choice and in the kind of home he enjoys most."

And when we add to this very profound teaching the fact that we are not even to offer a prayer in the class room, that we are letting a mere 3% of atheistic Americans deprive the remaining 97% of the tax payers of the right to have Bible reading in the schools, who is going to teach our children to remember that we believe in God?

Our churches are not reaching even a fraction of our children. Recently I sent a letter to each of the churches listed in Johnson City, asking them to let me know how many were in attendance in their Sunday Schools on November 13, 1966. I used this date because it was an unusually beautiful morning, not too hot or too cold, and there were no events that would take people out of the city in any numbers. I realize that it was not a scientific sampling, but I do believe that it would indicate trends. We are in a conservative area of the country where the Bible has been an important book.

Thirty-four churches are listed in the city directory and I received answers from 31. The estimated census of our town is 35,000. The 31 churches listed 7,675 in attendance and I added 700 for others that may have been too small to be listed. This gives 24% and if this is the case in these Tennessee mountains, I wonder what the per cent would be in the larger cities.

Homes have long since given up this responsibility. Very few door posts of any houses have any writing, real or implied, upon them. J. Edgar Hoover expressed the logical conclusion of such a path as our present generation is taking when he said:

"Criminals are not born. They are the product of neglect, the victims of indifference, the result of an age which has tossed morality to the junkyard."

II. FAITH IN THEMSELVES

Our history begins with that of our country, for the earliest records, going all the way back to 1607, contains mention of our ancestors. They were men and women who dared the Atlantic Ocean in boats that the average individual would not sail across an inland body of water today. No Coast Guard or a flying machine came to an S.O.S. or a Mayday. These people came to a land of which they knew nothing but they came with confident faces and unafraid. Many came because they could not worship their God in a manner which their conscience dictated. All of them refused to be slaves to a worn-out social system in the old world.

We hear much today about the 'do-it-yourself' movement. Do you realize that our ancestors were the original 'do-it-yourself' people? When they started that long trek from the other side of the ocean to this new world, at that time an uncharted wilderness, they had no resources other than themselves. When a house was needed, they must first cut down the trees from which the lumber was to come. The very clothes on their backs were grown out of the soil or on the backs of sheep. But throughout it all they accepted the tasks and carried them through. No federal subsidy for them! No crying to a government to provide for them. They had confidence they could do the impossible and they accomplished it. If there were no schools, they simply educated themselves. Many a man with the equivalent of a modern fourth-grade education was better educated than some of our modern college graduates. I like to feel that when we read of the ingenuity of the soldiers in the late war, we are simply recognizing this characteristic which has been lying dormant in too many of our citizens today. In short, they created a new world because they believed they could do it.

And there is another part of that characteristic which you and I have as our heritage. They refused to accept the low or the objectionable for social or political expedience. They were often criticized for this trait; called proud and prejudiced, but they set standards which made the South and our nation great. My early childhood was spent in the North, but there was never a day when my mother was not homesick for her beloved State of Virginia. And she held unswerving to her ideals of right and wrong. Even in her associations she was adamant, and questionable associates which we children would have made were disposed of firmly and completely by the terse sentence, "That isn't a good name in Virginia." Call it prejudice if you want to, but it helped to fix in us standards no individual can prosper long without. At the same time this standard of conduct required that the individual be honest in his dealings. We mountaineers may fight and feud among ourselves, but we despise the liar and the cheat.

To what extent are we actually remembering and conserving this second characteristic of our ancestors, whose faith in themselves carried them through all of the trials and tribulations of the beginning of our country?

In a recent address Ed W. Hiles, talking on *What's Happening to the Spirit of America?* made this suggestion which I think is a very good one. "Perhaps we are rewriting the 23rd Psalm so it now reads:

"The government is my shepherd, I shall not work
It maketh me to lie down in a fool's paradise,
It leadeth me into deep water,
But it refills my dinner pail."

From *The Reader's Digest,* March, 1966, p. 53., *Totaling Up,* comes this summary of the situation, "Some of Washington's leading economists, sharpening their pencils after the recent legislative binge, have come up with the following figures, fantastic yet real: In 1955, federal cash expenditures totaled $70.5 billion. By last year the outlay had climbed to $122.4 billion. This fiscal year it is expected to range between $132.3 and $135 billion. Even if the war in Vietnam is brought under control, the economists anticipate conservatively that by 1975—just nine (9) years hence—our spending will total around $204 billion, with more money going into welfare-state activity than into any other function. Such activity will account for 53.6 per cent of all federal outlays. (In 1955 it totaled 18.9 per cent.)

"Inflation and taxation will turn a nation of self-reliant people into a nation of individuals so dependent on government handouts that they have neither the will nor the capacity to endure."

III. BELIEF IN THEIR COUNTRY

There is a third characteristic we have received from our past, *love for the land of our birth.*

The poet described this very beautifully in the little poem,

"Breathes there a man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land?"

A little episode happened on our campus recently that shows what our present situation is. I had made a pact with our fraternities to lead the singing of the *Star Spangled Banner* at our Homecoming football game and was very much disappointed to see that many were not participating. The boys have always been most cooperative so the next week I said to a group, "What happened Saturday?" The boys looked a bit sheepish and one said, "Dean Ross, we don't know the words!" It may be a little thing but to me it indicates something about our patriotism.

We cannot acquire stature if we have no roots. The tree must be firmly rooted below the surface if it is to grow high above. To feel that America is a country of which we should be proud is part of our heritage. If at any time this land of ours falls below the standards our ancestors set for it we are required to speak out loud and long against error. We feel with Daniel Webster that no country can long remain if its people do not guard its actions.

This, then is our heritage. These are the traits which we inherited. This is the past in which our present is rooted. Without such a past, we could not have our present. As a professor of mine used to say on every

possible occasion. "A nation's stock in trade is its traditions. When the traditions are forgotten, the nation has become bankrupt." We hear many pessimists of today predicting the doom of our country. They may or may not be right. It depends entirely upon what we are remembering.

A few years ago we had as a speaker on our campus General Hugh Milton, Assistant Secretary of the Army. General Milton pointed out that we are now balanced upon the thinnest thread of survival that man has ever known. We now have in our power a force which can be equally effective in destroying mankind or in helping to provide a better world. The factor which will cause the scale of time to tip in the one or the other direction is the character of the individuals who govern that power. If those individuals are selfish, hesitant, weak, with low standards, we shall be destroyed as surely as the fact that day follows night.

If, on the other hand, people with the very characteristics which are the heritage of the people who established this nation are in charge, then that same force can be harnessed for the good of mankind. But be assured, there is no middle ground on which we can hide longer.

I have up to this time sketched a series of conditions to bring us up to the point I want to make. In view of present conditions, then, it is imperative that we conserve for our own and future generations those characteristics which are essential to world survival. The point may be translated simply in the words, "We must remember our heritage to do it; our very existence depends upon it."

And may I point out here, I am not advocating a return to the good old days. There is no time better than the present if we use it properly. But I am advocating the calling into play of those changeless values which are fundamental and have been fundamental since we have any record in history. It is just as absurd to recommend the repealing of the law of gravity or of the law of seed time and harvest as to propose the kind of world we want without proposing that that world be built on a foundation such as I have been describing.

As I look about I am becoming more and more discouraged. So many people are forgetting or never knew. In fact, man's greatest tragedy in this 20th century is his indifference to life's greatest values. Do you recall the story of Jacob and Esau? A number of years ago I heard a discussion of Esau, whom we met in Genesis 25:34. I have forgotten the source and so cannot give proper credit, but it is too similar a description of our present-day civilization to be denied. Moses said of him: "Esau did eat and drink and rose up, and went his way; thus Esau despised his birthright."

Here we had a man of unlimited opportunity, an opportunity such as exists in our own land today, and a man who at critical times made all the wrong choices and never knew what he missed. Like so many today, his was a tragic figure because he was so little interested in the values that make life more than food and body, more than clothing. He was the typical example of the insensitive man. Let us consider some of his choices.

Being the eldest son, it was expected that one day he would become the ruler of his clan and the inheritor of his grandfather, Abraham. It was a princely heritage, not only according to the law of his people but also according to the purpose of God, for he was in direct line through which God had promised to raise the chosen people. But Esau had little interest in these things. To him the past was dead and the future was unreal. His meanings and values revolved only around the present. He threw away his chances for a rich and significant life without knowing or caring what he had done.

Esau was not an ugly or an evil man. On the contrary, he was probably a most likeable man. He was kind and gentle to his old father. He was generous, shallow, and sentimental; the victim of his appetite; he was not a vicious man. What he chose was not evil in itself, but only evil because of what it displaced. The trouble was that he was so little interested in the higher treasures. He lived in the present and lived for pleasure. In a great historical moment the responsibilities which the past had thrust upon him were trying to lay hold on his loyalties, but he "did eat and drink, and rose up, and went his way" without realizing the tragic mistake he was making. He refused to recognize the obligations which his position in history imposed. His is the tragic figure of the man who despised his heritage and missed his destiny. Truly he had forgotten; and by forgetting had become bankrupt.

If we look about us we see that America is rapidly being peopled with Esaus, who are eating and drinking, rising up and going their way, and despising their heritage. We, who have been blessed with such a heritage, must not, we dare not, make this mistake.

How great is the heritage we share in the culture of our past? It has been laughed at so much that we have let the old ideals become as dilapidated as old mansions. What a free and healing stream of life might flow again in our nation if the hearts of people might be exalted with great ideas of spirituality, bravery, honor, duty, integrity, patriotism, so the best of the past could be made to live in the life of the present. We have the qualities which will tip the scales of the future in the direction of life rather than destruction if we are true to our birthright.

When he was leaving the Convention Hall after the final draft of the Constitution had been agreed upon, Benjamin Franklin was asked by a citizen, "Dr. Franklin, what have you given us?" His answer was, "We have given you a Republic, if you can keep it." If you can keep it—never forget this!

Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree that this is a very articulate, stirring, and deep expression of our heritage, one that should be read and reread by every citizen of our great Republic.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—V

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, requires the registration of male citizens of the United States within 5 days after his 18th birthday. The act, imposes liability for training and service in the Armed Forces upon such of these persons who are between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years. Some persons who have been deferred remain liable for training and service until age 35.

Congress placed in the Universal Military Training and Service Act the statement that in a democracy the privilege and duty of serving in the Armed Forces should be shared generally. General Hershey has testified that "a selective service system in some form more nearly approaches that objective than could any conceivable alternative method of raising and supporting armed forces."

Any system of selective service, however, contains inherent inequities which strike at the heart of a free society, and I think we must be prepared to face these problems more forthrightly than we have in the past. Under the present draft laws, we unduly impinge upon the liberties and opportunities of millions of American young men. We do so unfairly and unnecessarily. Every young man from 18½ to 26, unless disqualified, goes through 8 years of the most important period of his life with a Damocles sword hovering over his head—the constant threat of the draft. Even if he should not be drafted, his freedom is restricted during this period; the activities he can undertake are severely limited, freedom of choice is circumscribed. Employment opportunities are curtailed for many, for what the draft does, in effect, through its coercive power, is to restrict labor resources from moving into uses where their net productivity is greatest given individual preference patterns.

For many young men, avoiding the draft becomes the prime concern and a few have actually fled to Canada to escape conscription. Fleeing from compulsory military service, I might add, was the motivating purpose for large numbers of Europeans immigrating to the United States in the last century.

The draft disrupts the education, employment, and personal lives of many of our young male citizens. For this reason, the selective service law should be revised.

THE PRESIDENT SPEAKS OUT AGAINST WHITE BACKLASH

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a most perceptive article written on the subject of the President's fight against white backlash appeared recently in the New York Amsterdam News, one of the Nation's leading Negro newspapers, and I feel it warrants the attention of all of us in these days of racial unrest.

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) News, Nov. 12, 1966]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Within less than two months President Johnson has spoken out against the "white backlash" three times. He spoke against it in Brooklyn, in Pennsylvania and last Sunday at his home in Texas.

No President since Lincoln has said and done as much as President Johnson to help America free herself from the mental bondage of racial prejudice. No other American has done as much to enable the Negro citizen to walk with dignity and to live in security.

President Johnson is the chief civil rights leader of America. In this field he has no peer. No other politician in history has ignored the risks involved in speaking out for the rights of the Negro citizens. No

other President has done as much for them as he has. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, and his appointments of Negroes to his cabinet and other high posts are proof of this. And he has just begun to fight.

In his statement about the "white backlash" last Sunday, he said, among other things: "I think the so-called 'white backlash' is destructive, not only to the interests of Negro Americans, but of all those who stand to gain from humane and far-sighted Government."

He said this only two days before the elections, when many candidates of his party, such as Gov. Ed "Pat" Brown of California, and Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, were the objects of vicious backlash attacks. This took courage, the kind that's rare in politicians and non-politicians alike.

President Johnson speaks and acts with his heart and head. He feels deeply for all mankind. He is for the Negro not because he is one or because he wants his vote, but because he is a member of the human family.

Down in Texas, long before he was elected President, Lyndon Johnson and his family entertained Negroes in their home. He and Mrs. Johnson sent their daughters to a mixed school in Washington, when he was a Senator. He was battling for Negroes and Mexicans in Texas back in the '30's. He has never stopped. He can't. It's in his bones to fight for human rights, regardless of skin color or religion or nationality.

Lyndon Johnson has taken the lead in solving America's number one problem, the race problem. Let's hope other Americans will have the freedom of mind, the courage and the dedication to help him. America's survival may well depend upon it. Let's get behind President Johnson, a great world leader.

TWENTY-SIX MILLION WOMEN GET A BUM DEAL

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I direct your attention to a news story in the Washington Daily News of January 17, 1966, pointing out the bum deal that women are receiving. I could not have said it better myself.

The article follows:

NO CHANCE TO AMASS WEALTH—26 MILLION WOMEN GET A BUM DEAL

There are 26 million American women who hold jobs. They know precisely when the day's work starts and when it ends. They are for the most part on a five-day week and they get an annual vacation. But right there luck runs out on them.

The woman worker gets a bum deal in this country. She is discriminated against when she goes job hunting. She is passed over in favor of a man when promotions are handed out. Her salary scale is lower than that of a man who does the equivalent work.

FORTUNE SURVEY

Women own about half of the stocks, bonds and personal property in the United States but they didn't earn it themselves. Like Barbara Hutton and Doris Duke, they inherited it. It is difficult for a woman to amass wealth by her own efforts because most of the top jobs in business and industry are denied them. Fortune Magazine found that true when it ran a survey of several big companies:

"In spite of the loosening of prejudice, women still have not been given top jobs in the big corporations."

General Motors has no women executives and not even a woman designer.

General Electric has a few technicians, research associates and women in personnel, but no women executives except for the head of the advisory consumer institute.

Du Pont has a woman laboratory section head and a departmental control manager.

A.T.&T., altho 60 per cent of its employes are women, has in its executive group a lone woman assistant secretary.

Standard Oil of New Jersey has two assistant secretaries.

The Harvard Business Review also made a survey of women in top management jobs and concluded there had been no improvement since 1950 and added "the barriers to women are so great that there is scarcely anything to study."

FUTURE DIMS

And things are getting worse instead of better. The U.S. Women's Bureau puts it this way: In 1955 if two people were doing the same job the man would get $100 a week and the woman $64. In 1964 the situation had changed to the point where the man got $100 but the woman's pay had fallen to $60.

It has been an uphill fight all the way for the American woman worker. In the early years of the century she even had to fight her way into such employment as school teaching and clerking, two jobs for which women are well qualified.

AMENDING THE PRESENT SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the present Social Security Act. Very briefly, my bill provides for a $100 per month minimum primary benefit and an across-the-board increase of 10 percent.

Further, if enacted into law, my bill would raise the present limit on allowable outside earnings to $3,000 per year, a sum which is far more reasonable than the present figure of $1,500 per year.

Mr. Speaker, I am just one of a great many Members of this House who are alarmed at what the recent increase in the cost of living has done to those Americans who live solely on their social security benefits.

During the recent adjournment of the Congress, I was able to visit all parts of my Congressional District which is an urban area lying within the limits of Metropolitan New York City. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that among the greatest number of the people living in Hudson County, N.J., the need to raise social security payments is the single most important domestic issue in this 90th Congress. I have talked with hundreds of residents of Hudson County and when I say I am appalled at the plight of too many social security annuitants, I am not overstating my case.

Mr. Speaker, these people are not mendicants or chiselers. They are good people who either worked hard all their lives or are the widows of those who were guaranteed a secure future during their retirement years. These good people worked hard for security in their retirement years. Are they to be robbed of this because the dollar is worth less than it was during their productive years?

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that this Nation has commitments all over the world. And as a responsible Member of the Congress, I feel that we must honor our obligations. But we have an even greater obligation to those older American covered by the social security system, and as far as I am concerned, this obligation transcends all others.

I urge every Member of this House and particularly those members of the Committee on Ways and Means to take speedy action to raise social security benefits to a level which will provide at least a semblance of relationship to today's cost of living.

NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK ON GUAM

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the island of Guam has particular significance to those of us who served in the Pacific Theater during World War II.

Guam, the first U.S. territory occupied by the Japanese in World War II, also was the scene of a major turning point in the war during July and August of 1944, when the U.S. forces recaptured the island in a bloody battle.

The island is closely tied also in geography and in strategy to other significant battle sites in the Pacific—Tarawa, Guadalcanal, Saipan, the Battle of the Philippine Sea and Peleliu, as well as others.

The significance of Guam and of the entire war in the Pacific is great in our American history and pertinent sections of Guam merit careful historical development and preservation. Today there is no fitting commemoration of the sacrifices and the bravery displayed by the participants in the Pacific Theater and the Guamanian citizens. I believe it important that we wait no longer to provide significant commemoration and historical preservation of this kind.

I, therefore, am introducing today a bill to establish a national historic park on the island of Guam. As stated in the legislation the purpose is to "commemorate the bravery and sacrifices of those participating in the campaigns of the Pacific Theater in World War II, including the Guam campaign, and to interpret this significant period in the history of our Nation."

The park would include, but not be limited to, that site of the major American return to the island on July 21, 1944,

on Asan beachhead, and also include the mountain and plateau areas surrounding the beachhead, which comprise the major battlefield.

The Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to landscape, erect markers, construct a museum and other appropriate buildings, provide exhibits and interpretative material.

My legislation assures that development would be coordinated closely with the monument to the American war dead planned by the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Interpretation would deal with all aspects of the conflict, relating the significance of Guam to the war and the significance of the war to American history. This is information that Americans and all citizens of the world must not forget.

It is my hope that this legislation will receive your early attention and approval.

TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER McCORMACK

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I sometimes find myself in agreement with the editorial position taken by the Washington Post, but I most definitely part company with it over Tuesday morning's editorial which appeared under the headline, "Speaker on the Spot." I think the editorial does a disservice to a great American whose legislative contributions over the past four decades are well known to most of us.

I cannot agree that the events accompanying the organization of the 90th Congress indicate anything about the Democratic leadership. On the contrary, I believe the leadership on the majority side of the aisle remains what it was in the last Congress—a strong and smoothly functioning team, but one whose strength has been lessened as a result of last November's elections.

As for the writer's contention that a "sense of futility and despair" is building up on the Democratic side, I cannot imagine where he picked up such an idea. If there were anything approaching a "sense of futility"—and I do not happen to think there is—it would be based on the fact that we have lost our working majority on some of the more controversial issues. But this has nothing to do with the leadership; it has to do with the loss in the election of Democrats committed to the progressive programs which have been enacted during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

It does not take any particular insight to know that the 1966 election added strength to what has come to be known in the press as the "conservative coalition." This has been at the expense of those who have given the strongest support to the programs of the New Frontier and the Great Society.

We may have returned statistically to about where we stood before the 1964 election, but our leadership remains strong and firm under Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK. I for one look forward to working with the Speaker and his very able leadership partners, Majority Leader CARL ALBERT and Majority Whip HALE BOGGS, in support of programs to continue the progress which we have made in the last 5 years under this effective team.

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would avoid introducing a bill having to do with establishing a national park in a State other than my own. In the last Congress, however, I made an exception in the case of the redwoods of California, and I am making an exception again today.

I do so, Mr. Speaker, because I believe strongly that the majestic redwoods of California are a great national resource. They belong to all the people, not just the people of California, and they should be preserved for the enjoyment of this and future generations of Californians as well as all other Americans and people throughout the world.

In establishing a national park to save the redwoods, I think it is clearly in our national interest to select the best possible site including the largest area we can afford. It is with this thought in mind that I am once again joining our very distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], in introducing legislation to establish a 90,000-acre Redwood National Park in the valley of Redwood Creek. The bills which we are introducing today are similar, with only minor revisions, to the legislation we sponsored last year.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] for the leadership he has continued to provide in this effort to save the giant redwoods, a great national heritage. I hope the Congress will promptly and favorably consider this legislation to insure that no more of the priceless giant redwoods will fall victim to the ax and the saw.

THE SEATING OF MR. POWELL

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last week this House engaged in a historic debate on the narrow question of whether a Member, duly elected by his constituents, should be seated pending an investigation of his conduct and his right to serve.

As my colleagues will recall, I argued that the gentleman, having presented a valid certificate of election, should continue to hold his congressional seat at least until completion of such an investigation. However, this point of view did not prevail, and on final passage of the substitute resolution I voted with the majority. I did so because I feel strongly that an investigation should be made of the official conduct of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Since that debate my attention has been called to many articles and editorials on this subject. Two of these are of such interest that I should like to call them to the attention of my colleagues. The first is a column by Vermont Royster appearing in the Wall Street Journal of January 10. In this column Mr. Royster makes the distinction between Mr. POWELL as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and Mr. POWELL as a Member of the House. The second is an editorial appearing in the National Review of January 24. This editorial also makes that distinction and goes on to endorse the view that, ideally, Mr. POWELL should have been allowed to take his seat pending outcome of the investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert these articles at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 10, 1967]

THINKING THINGS OVER: ONE MAN'S VOTE

(By Vermont Royster)

Any way you look at him the Honorable Adam Clayton Powell, Representative to the United States Congress from the 18th District of New York, is not the most savory sort of fellow.

For all that he is a duly accredited minister of the Gospel, he has not won a reputation as a stalwart defender of the Seventh Commandment and he stands judicially accused of having slipped on the Ninth Commandment.

The secular version of the Ninth Commandment—"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor"—is embodied in the libel law, and for having said some false things about a woman neighbor the Congressman has been ordered by a court to pay damages, an order more breached than observed by Mr. Powell.

The dapper Harlem Congressman has also breached some canons of deportment if not of the Constitution. The Constitution, for example, protects the Congressman from being brought to account for misdemeanors during Congressional sessions, and the law of New York State protects him from being served with subpoenas in civil actions on Sunday.

For quite a long time he visited New York only on a Sunday in order to escape various process servers, and bore with patience the inconvenience of being away from his constituency so much. On other days than Sundays during Congressional holidays, and sometimes when there was no Congressional holiday, he renewed his patience by sunning on the beaches of Puerto Rico, where some of his companions often stayed although on the payroll of his office in Washington.

Others, however, have not borne all this quite so patiently. His fellow workers on the House Committee on Education and Labor complain that he neglects his work. A judge in New York so ran out of patience that he has cited Mr. Powell for criminal contempt of court, a thing that could be serious if the judge can ever catch the Congressman within his jurisdiction.

Anyway, the upshot of all this is a move to deny Mr. Powell his seat in Congress. The

idea is that at the opening of the new session today, when all the members arise to take their oaths of office, Mr. Powell will be asked to stand aside and his qualifications will be challenged by Representative Deerlin, a fellow Democrat from distant California.

And yet, if the move is carried out you ought to expect every good, conservative, thoughtful, liberal, upright believer in democracy and defender of the Constitution to rise in defense of Adam Clayton Powell's right to his seat. That is, if they simmer down long enough to look at the proposition put before them.

On the basis of the record a voter who classed himself in any of the above categories might justifiably decide not to vote for Mr. Powell in any election.

Nonetheless, the voters of the 18th Congressional District of the State of New York feel otherwise. They first chose Mr. Powell to represent them in Congress back in 1944, and whatever the rest of us may think of the way he has represented his constituents, they have been satisfied. They reelected him in every biennial election thereafter.

By the time of election day last November the voters of the 18 District were well aware of Mr. Powell's peculiarities. His opponent—also a Negro, which took out any backlash or frontlash—made them the chief issue of the campaign. Mr. Powell won handily, with nearly three-quarters of the votes.

This is the question before the House:

There being no challenge to the election returns qualifying Mr. Powell as victor (a matter on which the Constitution makes the House the sole judge), may the House in the guise of judging his electoral qualifications disfranchise the voters of New York's 18th District because of disapproval of the manners, morals, work habits or philosophy of life of the man the voters elected?

Thus stated, it ought to be self-evident that an affirmative answer is a dangerous proposition. If it can be applied against one set of voters it can be applied against another, in another time and in a different emotional atmosphere.

What it comes down to is that we either believe that one man's vote is as weighty as another's, or we don't. If we do, then the votes of those in Harlem cannot be disregarded or cast out on the argument that they elected an unworthy office-holder because of their foolishness, ignorance, bigotry, misguided emotion or whatever.

This is, admittedly, sometimes a painful doctrine to cling to. It's by no means true that one man's vote is necessarily as intelligent, or even as honest, as another man's; in some places illiteracy is no bar to the voting booth. It's by no means proven, either, that in a democracy of universal suffrage the thoughtless and ignorant voters will somehow always cancel themselves out. A perfectly logical case can be made for setting some standards for the voting franchise.

But no standards of age or literacy will guard against foolishness. However improbable it may be, it's not impossible that someday a man with a character less meritorious than Adam Clayton Powell's could be elected President.

The rub comes when you turn the proposition around. If the voters of the 18th District aren't to be allowed to choose their representative, who is to choose for them? The nub is that democracy includes the right to vote foolishly. You can't take away the one without destroying the other.

If the House wants to choose someone else to chair the Education and Labor Committee, as the action of the Democratic caucus indicated yesterday, that's its business. Indeed, if it is alleged Mr. Powell's conduct as chairman has been derelict, the disgrace is on the House for letting him keep the post as long as he did. That's where the disgrace is, too, if the House rules are so loose that a member can cause a scandal by nepotism, padded office payrolls or junketing about at taxpayers' expense. Let the gentlemen look to themselves.

And of course if Mr. Powell has violated the law or stands in contempt of court, the remedy there is as for any other person. If he hasn't been properly brought to book the cause is not any Constitutional immunity but political fright.

If there's rightly a wrong there's a remedy. But we can't put things right by applying the wrong one.

[From the National Review, Jan. 24, 1967]

THE JIG IS UP, BABY

The sacking of Adam Clayton Powell Jr. from the chairmanship of the Committee was an unalloyed vindication of justice and conscience. To be sure, there are those who have tried to opportunize on it, for instance, by suggesting that while the Democratic caucus was at it, it should have removed William Colmer of Mississippi from the chairmanship of the House Rules Committee. To have done any such thing would be to confuse personal convictions and larcenous conduct as equally disqualifying. William Colmer is a Southern conservative whose rights to the chairmanship of the Committee are based on seniority. It would have been as wrong to deny him his post in advance of any evidence that he will abuse his privileges, as it would have been wrong to deny Adam Powell his post when first he occupied it four years ago.

The subsequent vote, to suspend Powell's voting rights pending a full inquiry into his sordid affairs, was probably incautious. The temptation to rebuke Powell is, to be sure, a temptation to behave honorably. But look, in fact, at what happened: the division was pretty much political. On one side almost all Republicans and rural and Southern Democrats, on the other side most of the big city Democrats. The tug of politics, in other words, greatly affected that last vote. And indeed you had people like Robert Kennedy and Jacob Javits expressing a fussy concern for the temporary deprivation of Harlem's voice in the House of Representatives, which is a laugh considering that Harlem's voice has spent most of the time representing his constituents in the Bahamas.

But everybody understood that the ejection of Powell under current circumstances carried political overtones. And when congressmen are not seated, it should be in punishment of high moral or legal irregularities. That Mr. Powell is guilty of these is a fact about as incandescent as the midday sun. But procedures count, and it is the rule that congressmen are expellable only by a two-thirds vote, and it is at least a presumption that that vote should be taken only after a full hearing. Congressman Udall called it "overkill" to suspend Power pending the five-week investigation, especially now that he had been deprived of his effective power as Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. Why not proceed with the investigation, and argue the case for expelling Powell before the entire Congress when all the facts are neatly accumulated; and of course permit Mr. Powell to give his defense, which of course will be to accuse all his accusers of racism.

Thus should it ideally have gone, leaving Powell at least for a few weeks more, occupying his seat. And the tradition-watchers, let us record, have made a good point about the danger of politicalizing such action as is taken against an individual member of Congress.

But in the future, the fact that Congress finally came to life on the issue of Adam Powell is certain to outweigh the danger it ran by its procedural precipitateness. The courageous Lionel Van Deerlin, Democrat of California, scoffed at the notion that Powell had not had his day in court. "Nearly a dozen judges in New York States," he commented, "will tell you where the fault lies. We who are charged with helping write the laws of the land must show respect for those laws, and more particularly, for the other branch of government. If Article I, Section 6, is to be so twisted to provide protective cover, if the election to the House of Representatives carries a license for scofflaws, if this chamber is to become a haven for fugitives, then . . . God help the Congress of the United States."

Powell's defense was that he has not been charged with a felony, to which the answer is, not yet. It isn't always exactly clear, but somehow it has crept into the governing ethic that if you steal money that belongs to the government, somehow that isn't exactly theft. It seems to be incontrovertibly clear that Mr. Powell used government money to transfer himself, his friends, and his harem to the watering spots of our prodigal planet. What he committed against the lady in Harlem was not a felony, but his subsequent refusal to obey court orders makes him something more than merely a traffic-offense scofflaw. "This building," said Adam Powell, pointing to the Capital, "houses the biggest bunch of elected hypocrites in the world." And earlier, on the floor of the House, he spoke about the skeletons in the congressmen's closets. Well, let him disinter those skeletons, no matter what are the consequences of the exposure. It would be the most public-minded contribution of his career.

DEPENDENTS MEDICAL CARE ACT

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I introduce here today, and commend to my colleagues' attention, an amendment to the Dependents Medical Care Act. It is my conviction that passage of this amendment is, purely and simply, a matter of equity, equity for our men in uniform and their families. It is also my conviction that the present inequity is so glaring that, sooner or later, action must inevitably be taken and it would be to the enduring credit of this 90th Congress if it took that action at the earliest possible moment.

The provisions of the measure are quite simple. It would provide dental care benefits for the dependents of our military men, on active duty or retired. The care would be provided in civilian facilities, primarily by the private dental practitioner. The program has a schedule of deductibles to assure both prudent use of the benefits and fiscal stability for the Government. The net result of the amendment would be to provide dental care benefits similar to the medical care benefits already available to military dependents.

As my colleagues know, I am not introducing here some novel notion; I am not urging upon the House an untried or untested idea. It has long been recognized by those responsible for administering military affairs that the lack of dental care benefits constitutes a substantial and unjustifiable hindrance to our goal of achieving a stable, career-

oriented military force. Various civilian and military authorities have spoken out on this issue over the past years. Almost without exception, they have recognized that the lack of dental care benefits was undesirable. Almost without exception, they have urged action. In my judgment, it is now time to stop urging action and to start taking it. Decisive documentation exists, documentation that is more than sufficient to prove the case, to demonstrate the need for the kind of step forward I am suggesting here today. Let me briefly sketch some of the details of the documentation.

First of all, dental disease is a universal phenomenon. Its most common manifestation, tooth decay, attacks 97 percent of the population. This is the estimate of dental experts, though in this instance, I suppose, the experts are merely confirming something we all know from our personal experience. Most serious types of oral disease also manifest themselves regularly. Each year, some 6,000 babies are born with cleft lip or palate. Each year, some 23,000 people fall victim to oral cancer, which accounts for one in every 40 cancer deaths.

Now, obviously donning a military uniform does not make a person immune from the ravages of dental diseases. The military population, being more or less a cross-section of the general population, are typical victims of tooth decay, gum disease, cleft lip and palate or oral cancer. In the instance of the military man himself, we recognize this by providing dental care and by pursuing a vigorous program of dental health education. We provide neither for his dependents. Is it reasonable for dependents to expect, to want such dental benefits? In urging favorable consideration of the amendment I introduce today, am I asking for mere equity, and not special privilege? My answer to both those question is "Yes."

The compensation earned by a member of the military has traditionally been, as you know, a combined matter of pay and services, services such as those provided in post exchanges or such as those provided in service hospitals and clinics. In great part, this tradition has come about because of the unique features of military life, the constant relocations not only within the borders of the Nation but overseas as well. Taken by itself, then, the salary paid to a soldier or sailor, a marine or airman, is not very high. We all recognize this. The salary scale places him at a frequent disadvantage in securing necessary services for his family, including of course, dental care services.

This fact has become especially obvious lately because of actions taken by the 89th Congress with regard to the general population. I refer here particularly to the newly enacted title XIX of the Social Security Act. As you know, title XIX essentially provides State and national assistance for those families termed medically needy, that is to say those families who, while they can support the general cost of maintaining a household, find themselves often unable to afford health care to the degree it is needed. More than 25 of our States and territories have enacted legislation enabling them to participate in title XIX programs. As part of the legislation, income standards are set to help define who is medically needy. These vary, of course, from locale to locale. In my State, a family of four with an income of about $3,800 would be eligible for assistance. In some States, the figure is $3,400, $4,000, $4,176, or $4,300. An income of that dimension, in the opinion of the respective States, entitles a family to receive help in securing health care, including, in many instances, dental care. I think most of us would agree that these are not unreasonable income levels for this purpose.

Study then, if you will, the situation of the military man in comparison with these figures. A married man with one child earns at the E–3 level, $2,772; at E–4, $4,417; at E–5, $4,964, or at O–1, $5,429. As of late 1965, there were nearly 150,000 members of the Armed Forces earning less than $2,000 a year, this last estimate having been made in conjunction with consideration of the Military Pay Act of 1965.

There has been another development in civilian life that seems to me also worth mentioning here. That is the rapidly growing movement in private industry to provide to the employee, at reduced cost or without cost, prepaid dental insurance not only for the employee himself but for his dependents as well. Today there are nearly 3 million persons covered under such programs and observers in dentistry, in the insurance field and in labor-management relations agree that it will burgeon swiftly in the foreseeable future.

It is equity, then, that we are asking in offering this amendment; not a favor, not a special privilege, but equity for the military man.

Passage of this proposed amendment should have as well, it may be noted, more than one good effect. Its major achievement, of course, will be to enable dependents to receive regular and comprehensive dental care. That alone would justify its passage. But in addition to this, every indication is that its passage will also make a substantial contribution to our continuing effort to attract more men to a military career and to stabilize our Armed Forces.

A survey taken by the Air Force in 1962, for example, showed that 36 percent of the officers questioned and 50 percent of the enlisted men said that provision of dependents' dental care would affect their decision as to extending their period of service. In the same survey, 31 percent of the officers and 50 percent of the enlisted men said that the lack of dependents' dental care affected the health of their families.

The Surgeon General of the Army commented, in a report made during fiscal 1965, that:

> Lack of provision for civilian dental care . . . continues to have an adverse effect on morale.

He has also noted that, during the period referred to, Army emergency relief fund provided almost $300,000 in financial assistance to Army families in meeting bills for medical, dental, or hospital expenses. The Acting Surgeon General of the Navy has reported that the Navy Relief Society spent over $330,000 on dental care alone for dependents. The Air Force Aid Society paid out nearly $90,000 for the same purpose. The Chief of the Coast Guard Office of Personnel has noted that exclusion of dental benefits from the present program is a "real and ever-present problem."

The Marine Corps Commandant, in 1965, made what is perhaps the most cogent summary of the situation when he noted that:

> Dental care costs cannot be met within normal budgeting of most enlisted members and many junior officers. The serviceman too often faces a choice between neglect of needed dental care for his dependents, "moonlighting" to supplement his military pay, having his wife seek civilian employment or obtaining a loan to cover the cost of the dental care. Obviously, the cost of dental care at government expense would be definite morale and career incentive factor.

With this, then, as groundwork in documenting the fairness and urgency of the request, I should like to comment briefly on the few simple provisions of my proposed amendment.

It will be noted, first of all, that the bill provides that care will be provided by private practitioners, by the private sector. This seems to me absolutely essential. It would be literally impossible for the services to provide on base regular, comprehensive dental care to families. The uniformed dental services today, although exerting themselves to the fullest, are admittedly just meeting their prime mission, which is to care for the active duty personnel. To triple their workload would be to cripple them completely in relation to this primary mission.

Some, I am aware, would suggest that the services expand the "space available" concept that is in effect in a limited way at present. The fact is, however, that this stopgap solution founders on the fact that the present size of the dental corps and number of care facilities make it unreasonable to expect that there could be any significant amount of care given through this mechanism. In addition, as the chief dental officer of the Air Force, Brig. Gen. Lee M. Lightner, has pointed out, it would endanger the primary mission of the dental corps since many men on active duty would rather have their wives and children treated than themselves and might postpone their own visits in an effort to accomplish this. And finally, in seeking equity for the military, we would not wish to do something that creates an inequitable situation for someone else. And it would clearly be inequitable to draft dentists into the Armed Forces so that there would be sufficient professional people available to treat women and children who are, essentially, civilian.

The program contains deductibles, as I have already noted, to assure prudent use of the program and help maintain fiscal soundness. With the deductibles, first-year costs to the Government are estimated to be on the order of $130 million. The deductible differs, it should be noted, between adults, for whom it is $25, and children, for whom

it is $10. This distinction is drawn in accordance with expert professional opinion, voiced frequently by the American Dental Association, that children deserve special attention since, if we can succeed in developing sound oral health and good oral hygiene habits in the young, it will pay lifelong dividends.

There is another aspect of the amendment that reflects the professional judgment of the American Dental Association. It is that section that provides that the program enacted will be reasonably comprehensive in nature, covering dental disease in all of its manifestations. I think we can agree with the dental profession that artificial limitations in types of care covered makes no better sense in dentistry than it would in any other kind of health care coverage. The only exclusion is for dentistry of the purely cosmetic kind.

Since I have now referred to the American Dental Association twice, this would be an appropriate moment to note that while I am introducing this legislation on my own initiative, that organization testified in support of an effort I made in late 1966 similar to the one I am making here today. Such support is, naturally, important to the measure and I am grateful for it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I am introducing here today a measure that deserves and will receive unanimous support from all those acquainted with the facts of the case. The only possible difference that might exist between us is on the question of timing, of urgency. My study of the situation has convinced me that the matter is urgent, indeed, and that is why I have worked toward introducing the measure this early in the life of the 90th Congress. The evidence is overwhelming, the testimony of servicemen themselves documents the need, report after report of the surgeons general of the uniformed services confirm the need. It is time for Congress to act, to redress an inequity by enacting a comprehensive dental care program for military dependents.

TO AMEND IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a measure today, which I had introduced in the 89th Congress, to amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in order that the former labor provisions of the immigration laws may be restored.

Under the old law, the Secretary of Labor, from time to time, if the need arose, would sign a certification disapproving the admission of certain workers because their admission would adversely affect the labor market in the United States.

Under the new law, the exact oposite is true. With only a few exceptions, all intending immigrants must first secure approval, or labor certification, from the Secretary of Labor, stating that their admission will not adversely affect U.S. citizens similarly employed, before their application for immigration will receive even initial consderation.

This harassing requirement has given the Labor Department almost complete control over the ebb and flow of our immigration. We have been told that the purpose for this requirement is to help ease unemployment in the United States. Yet, not too long ago, the Attorney General said in San Francisco that immigrants add but a tiny fraction to our total labor force.

In addition, immigrants are not all workers, but include wives and families, who become consumers and add to the demand for goods and services. This is actually a helpful force for expanding our economy and creating new jobs.

The new procedure has also bogged down our Labor Department with thousands of applications for labor clearance and has multiplied the paperwork of Government agencies throughout the country. Applications are now required to be processed through local, city, State, and regional offices of the Labor Department. The time lag in processing these applications strains the patience and endurance of employers. The employment offices throughout the country are cluttered with alien clearance forms which sometimes take up to 6 months to process. Instead of devoting themselves to actual employment of persons needing jobs, these agencies are weighted down with forms and procedures which may never result in bringing jobs and applicants together.

The labor certification requirement has not only increased Government paperwork, without benefiting our immigration or labor practices, but over a period of time, will actually restrict immigration to a mere trickle.

Already, statistics compiled by the visa office show that the flow of immigrants, who are not related to American citizens, has dropped sharply since the labor certification requirement went into effect. Of 278,538 visas issued under the new law from December 1965 to July 1966, only 4,145 went to workers. The rest went almost entirely to relatives.

Our country's greatness has been built on the contributions of our immigrants, and halting the flow of immigration in this manner could only result in restricting the growth and prosperity of our Nation.

My measure would reinstate the labor requirements as they appeared in the old immigration law. This provision of the old law has survived the test of time and use—it has worked, and worked well—and only by returning to it can we further strengthen our new immigration law.

AN INCREASE IN OUR SERVICEMEN'S GROUP LIFE INSURANCE LONG OVERDUE

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennesse. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to increase to $25,000 the amount of Government insurance which may be carried by the members of our Armed Forces.

At present, as is generally known, the maximum amount of insurance provided by the Government for our servicemen is $10,000. What is not generally known, and this is a disturbing fact, is that this sum has not been increased 1 cent over the half century in which the program has been operating since enactment in 1917.

In the year 1917, $10,000 represented a far greater sum in purchasing power than it does today. In fact, today it requires $25,615 in current dollars to equal the purchasing power of $10,000 in 1917. This figure is based on the Consumer Price Index as of October 1966 and was provided by the Department of Commerce. The figure is strong evidence of the lack of equity provided by the existing maximum.

In addition, I feel that some provision should be made to make available to all veterans the insurance which would be afforded by the increased maximum and am having a study made as to the feasibility and practicality of additional legislation in this area.

WHAT ARE THE LIMITS OF DISREGARD FOR PUBLIC OPINION?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, what are the limits of disregard for public opinion?

Probably the main reason that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL does not have his seat in Congress today is because of the pressure of outraged public opinion. I doubt that there is one Member of this House who has not been deluged with mail from angry constituents demanding that action be taken against the flamboyant Representative.

But there are still some areas of this country where not only is public opinion ignored, but where incompetence and insensitivity to public pressure are, in fact, rewarded.

Three months ago, I brought to the attention of the public the Liuni adoption case, in which the welfare commissioner of Ulster County denied the adoption of a blue-eyed, blond-haired foster daughter by her brunet, Italian foster parents on the basis that the ethnic backgrounds of the child and the prospective parents did not match.

The only weapon the Liuni family had in its fight against the incompetence of the welfare commissioner was public

opinion. Fortunately for them and their daughter, public opinion came to their rescue and the Liuni case had a happy ending.

The behavior of the welfare commissioner throughout the entire case demonstrated his total lack of qualification for the position that he holds. Under the new standards established for welfare commissioners in New York State he only holds his present position as a result of a grandfather clause contained in the law.

During the proceedings, the Ulster County Board of Supervisors demonstrated its contempt for public opinion by reappointing Mr. Fitzsimmons to his position, after it was pointed out that he had not been legally appointed in the first place. At that time a proper concern for the public interest should have caused the board of supervisors to at least defer their decision until the Liuni case was settled and a full debate could take place on his qualifications. Ignoring the protestations of the press and the public, the board of supervisors reappointed Mr. Fitzsimmons.

This is an example of the product of an entrenched power structure which for years has been able to trample upon public opinion and get away with it.

This was bad enough, but imagine the incredulity with which I discovered this week that, in the midst of the Liuni proceedings, the board of supervisors voted their welfare commissioner a $3,100 increase in salary. And they did not even have the nerve to publicize this fact. Mr. Fitzsimmons' salary increase was a part of the budget, and when the budget was passed, so was the welfare commissioner's salary increase.

I bring this to the attention of the Congress and the American people to emphasize the importance of maintaining a constant vigilance over the behavior and conduct of all public officials, whether they serve in the Halls of Congress or in the county courthouse.

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT OF UNION COUNTY, N.J.—OPERATION NOVA SCOTIA—AREA OF ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. ST GERMAIN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Union County, N.J., which I am privileged to represent part of in the House of Representatives, has among its many distinctions one of the finest, most effective junior achievement programs in the country. As Vice President H. H. HUMPHREY has said of it:

> Junior Achievement brings young talent to our Free Enterprise System . . . (it) is a dynamic project perfecting the talents and sharpening the abilities of our young people . . . (it is) a job well done.

Its goal is to inspire our young people to rededicate themselves to the principles of free enterprise, and to effectively teach and demonstrate that our American free enterprise system is not just a system for carrying on business, but much more: The best system promoting human progress while preserving individual liberty—a system which leads the world in industrial growth and high standards of living.

By providing the necessary guidance and facilities to hundreds of dynamic and bright young men and women of high school age, Junior Achievement makes possible a unique opportunity for young people to obtain a direct and personal understanding of the problems, procedures and rewards of business under the American free enterprise system. The fact that these young people are given the full responsibilities involved in the running of a small company, under the auspices of a parent company, is an experience which can never be equaled at their age. These young people are introduced early to the problems of modern competitive industry. They learn what the responsibilities involved in running a business are. As it is a veritable company they run, they must accept all aspects of management, cost accounting, sales, distribution and so forth. They get a chance, early in life, to know what teamwork is, and how to react in a competitive, exciting, challenging situation.

And while this is undoubtedly a great deal of fun for the participants, we, on the national level, must recognize that the young people who participate in these programs are individuals who will hold responsible, leadership roles in the America of the future. We can do no less than to thank the community and the business leaders of Union County, N.J., for helping America to help and perpetuate herself.

In recognition of this, I call on the full House of Representatives to unanimously support the inclusion of the following remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal]

VALUABLE LESSONS WELL LEARNED: "WELL DONE" FOR JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT DESERVED

Vice President Humphrey's "well done" commendation of Junior Achievement in the Union County-Carteret area was fully merited by the industrial sponsors, the advisers and the boys and girls participating in this valuable exercise in free enterprise.

Learning by doing, with its immeasurably good impact, 800 high school students have been operating junior companies at the JA center in Elizabeth since last September. Visitors observing them at their work are impressed by the serious intent of these young people in absorbing the principles of America's private enterprise system.

Some of the operations are more profitable than others, as in the adult trade world, but all of them teach worth-while lessons about business practices and the economy of the U.S.

As a deserved reward for outstanding work, 28 of the Junior Achievers will be going to Ireland soon for a week's visit combining tours of industrial, educational and cultural sites. Previous trips have taken JA groups to California, Canada, Puerto Rico and West Germany, where in Berlin they saw the wall which demarcates the freedom of personal initiative and communism's state-controlled way of doing things.

The Union County-Carteret area is indebted to the industries which sponsor these junior companies and to the adult advisers who devote many hours to guiding and encouraging young people in constructive and productive endeavors.

Activities such as these help to counter the aimlessness which is all too apparent among boys and girls in America today.

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT OF UNION COUNTY, INC.,
Elizabeth, N.J., October 10, 1966.

To: Junior Achievement Advisers.
From: J. Kenneth Roden, Executive Vice President.
Subject: Operation Nova Scotia.

AWARD WINNING JUNIOR ACHIEVERS TO VISIT NOVA SCOTIA—THE AREA OF ACHIEVEMENT

There is a definite need for all of us who are associated with Junior Achievement to inspire our young people to rededicate themselves to the principles of Free Enterprise, and to effectively teach and demonstrate that our American Free Enterprise System is not just a system for carrying on business, but much more: The best system for promoting human progress while preserving individual freedom—a system which leads the world in industrial growth and high standards of living.

Nationwide surveys of high school students confirm the need for dynamic, positive programs to create better understanding of how business operates, its problems, its invaluable contributions to the American way of life.

Operation Nova Scotia will be a three-pronged youth incentive, economic education, and public relations project. It will commence in October 1966 and continue throughout the Junior Achievement program year. It will be climaxed with a week-long visit to Nova Scotia in May 1967 by about 28 Junior Achievers, and adult advisers from industry. There the Junior Achievers will have an opportunity to develop personal knowledge of the industrial educational, scientific and cultural growth resulting from Nova Scotia's Voluntary Economic Plan (VEP). They will return better prepared to assume their future responsibilities as voters, community leaders, employees and managers in a world where international relationships are becoming increasingly more important.

The group will meet with American and Nova Scotian government leaders and educators here and abroad. Arrangements for these meetings are being worked out in cooperation with the Nova Scotia Department of Trade and Industry and the Development Counsellors International, Ltd.

Extensive press, radio and television coverage, locally and in Nova Scotia, will be planned throughout the 1966–1967 program year, as well as during the visit to Nova Scotia.

The Itinerary and Program for the visit to Nova Scotia will be distributed at a later date.

WHY NOVA SCOTIA?

Because Nova Scotia is an Area of Achievement and we believe it offers one of the best current case studies of private enterprise in action.

Today, a confident, dynamic spirit prevails there and Nova Scotia is experiencing an economic expansion which is comparable, although on a smaller scale, to the economic miracles of West Germany witnessed firsthand by a Junior Achievement group which visited West Germany and Berlin in 1963 as part of the Operation Free Enterprise project that year, and in the 1965–1966 Operation Free Enterprise climaxed by a visit to Ireland where the Junior Achievers witnessed the successful transition from an agricultural to industrial economy.

In Nova Scotia there will be visits to industrial installations, educational and cultural centers. Arrangements will be made for the Junior Achievers to meet with Nova

Scotian student groups and to be guests in the homes of industrialists and their families.

The most important phase of the visit in Nova Scotia will be meetings with industrialists who will discuss with the group the results of their Voluntary Economic Plan. VEP, pioneered in Nova Scotia, is the first attempt by a Canadian province to chart the course of its economic development with widespread citizen participation. VEP is designed to generate 3,400 new jobs annually and to double the annual rate of growth in capital investment by 1968.

Nova Scotia today is bubbling with new ideas and excitement about the future. Its new spirit is buttressed by solid achievements in economic development:

Investment in manufacturing has doubled in the past two years, with the new investment rate increasing 27% in 1965.

Factory shipments, capital spending and personal incomes increased at a faster rate in Nova Scotia last year than in any other Canadian province.

The Voluntary Economic Plan gives the people of Nova Scotia a feeling of participation in their own economic destiny. This sharing of problem solving comes from the grass roots, with private groups studying their own problems and finding solutions. The industrial expansion drive is gaining momentum. The larger and more diversified industrial base is proving to be a springboard to prosperity.

OBJECTIVES OF OPERATION NOVA SCOTIA

Operation Nova Scotia has been planned and developed by the Board of Directors of Junior Achievement of Union County to meet our present-day challenges. Its objectives are:

(1) *To provide Junior Achievers and Advisers with a positive educational and incentive program designed to stimulate full understanding of the principles, motivations and rewards of the American private enterprise system*

Operation Nova Scotia will demonstrate that every individual—whether employee, manager or community leader—must be ever aware that the vigor of the American private enterprise system depends upon a heritage that attaches prime importance to liberty, opportunity for the individual, and personal initiative. It will emphasize the responsibility of the individual to adequately prepare himself to carry his share of the load, and to discharge his responsibilities to the best of his ability.

(2) *To give Junior Achievers actively engaged in owning and operating their own junior companies an opportunity to feel the pulsebeat of American industry and international trade, and to learn first-hand the economic facts of life in business at home and abroad*

Emphasis will be on the need for profits and a high level of individual productivity, without errors. The effect of business profits upon the everyday lives of young people, their families, the community, and the economy as a whole will be stressed.

Operation Nova Scotia will demonstrate that each individual's contribution, if properly utilized, will result in a profit to himself, to his employer, to the community, and to the nation. It will further demonstrate that corporate profits are the lifeblood of business which assure continued growth, prosperity and stability of the economy, all of which are more valuable and desirable than personal security through hand-out or a welfare state. It will show how corporate profits become job producers.

The experience of international travel by jet aircraft will demonstrate to the Junior Achievers how, under the Free Enterprise System, research and development in the transportation industry and aggressive promotion, have advanced international trade, travel and communications and generally narrowed the world's horizons. Discussions with Nova Scotian industrialists and students, and visits to industries there, will further enhance the Achievers' understanding of international trade and human relations.

(3) *To have successful American and Nova Scotian businessmen, experienced in the various stages of education and business advancement, convince the Junior Achievers of the dollars and cents value of a high school diploma and to demonstrate clearly the increased income and opportunities available to young people who obtain higher education or seek technical or other specialized training*

The project will demonstrate how profitable and essential continued education can be and how short-range thinking with emphasis on short-term income opportunities and the desire for maximum job security and benefits, without personal initiative and productivity, and responsible leadership fail to develop the full potential of the individual.

(4) *To maintain the high standards of performance, productivity and prestige of the Junior Achievement program*

Special emphasis will be placed on stimulating superior performance at all levels of Junior Achievement activity, development of personal initiative, creative thinking, responsible leadership, good attendance, punctuality and accuracy. Improved production techniques to reduce operating costs will be encouraged. Aggressive safety programs and a Zero Defect quality control program will be required. Sales incentive programs will be sponsored.

(5) *To demonstrate to Junior Achievers, parents, educators and the community at large the degress of interest which local businessmen have in young people, and to give recognition to business and industrial sponsors and supporters of Junior Achievement for their unselfish efforts on behalf of young people*

This program will demonstrate to the community that local business and industrial organizations are good neighbors, willing to help prepare young people to accept responsibilities of business management and professional and community leadership.

There will be widespread publicity about Operation Nova Scotia and opportunities for good employee and community relations will be initiated by Junior Achievement on behalf of its sponsors and other participants.

(6) *To give Junior Achievers an opportunity to become good will ambassadors and to enable them to feel first-hand the pulsebeat of international relations*

The Junior Achievers will develop a keener understanding of the importance of sincere cooperation in international relations in all areas: human relations, government, and particularly business and industry. They will be introduced to the industrial, educational and cultural aspects of life in Nova Scotia through visits and association with businessmen and their families, government officials, and educational groups.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

There will be extensive community participation in Operation Nova Scotia. Every effort will be made to stimulate the entire community to rededicate themselves to the principles of Free Enterprise.

NOMINATION AND SELECTION OF ACHIEVERS FOR THE AWARD TRIP

In April, outstanding Junior Achievers will be selected for the award trip scheduled for late May 1967.

Provided that the Junior Achievement company and its individual Junior Achiever members have met the standards set forth in the Performance Standards Bulletin, the company will have the privilege of nominating a member for participation in the Operation Nova Scotia award trip. Consideration should be given only to outstanding Junior Achievers based on performance in the following areas:

Leadership.

Personal initiative and creative thinking.

Appearance and grooming.

Poise.

Ability to get along with young people and adults.

Originality of product.

Production and sales techniques and their successful application.

Attendance and punctuality.

Adherence to and proper execution of safety regulations.

Rating under Zero Defects quality control program.

Accuracy of company records.

Knowledge of Junior Achievement company operations.

Knowledge of sponsoring company's activities.

Knowledge and understanding of the values, workings and benefits to the individual of the Free Enterprise System.

Knowledge of the culture, history and economic development of Nova Scotia.

Future educational and employment plans of the Junior Achiever and degree to which plans are being implemented.

The degree of personal participation in bringing the Junior Achievement company into full participation in Operation Nova Scotia should be an important factor in the selection of nominees. Bear in mind that the Junior Achievers who visit Nova Scotia will be representatives of our industrial and educational community and will be guests of important businessmen and government and educational leaders abroad.

A nomination form will be provided by Junior Achievement with instructions for completion and the due date.

All nominees wil be interviewed by a panel of Junior Achievement Directors, members of the Chamber of Commerce, and other business and community leaders, at a time and place to be specified by Junior Achievement.

Selection of Junior Achievers who will participate in the award trip will be announced about three weeks in advance, when instructions will be issued for obtaining written permission from parents or guardians, health certificates, and travel requirements, and other pre-trip details.

NEW JERSEY STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FREE ENTERPRISE AWARD

To encourage and inspire our young people and their Advisers to develop their capabilities to the highest possible degree, the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce will again present its Free Enterprise Award to the sponsor of the outstanding Junior Achievement company.

The winning company will be selected by the Chamber of Commerce Awards Committee. The award will be presented to the President or chief executive officer of the *sponsoring* company at the annual dinner of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce.

MANAGEMENT AWARD

To further encourage and inspire Junior Achievers and their Advisers, the Board of Directors of Junior Achievement of Union County has announced a new, very important award competition. The Management Award will be in the form of a plaque inscribed with the Junior Achievement company name and the name of the sponsoring industry.

The Junior Achievement Awards Committee will select the company to receive the award, based on strict criterion designed to bring about excellence in all phases of Junior

Achievement company management, and the plaque will be presented to the winning company at the stockholder meeting in May.

INCENTIVE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

The Board of Directors of Junior Achievement of Union County has delegated responsibility for the planning and execution of Operation Nova Scotia to Mr. J. Kenneth Roden, Executive Vice President. He will be responsible for liaison with American and Nova Scotian government officials and agencies, for other participating organizations.

The Board of Directors has named a Committee to advise and assist Mr. Roden, who will also serve on the Committee. Members of the Incentive Program Committee are:

James D. Abeles, President, Purolator Products, Inc.; William M. Bristol, III, Group Vice President, Bristol-Myers Company; Joseph Ayares, President, New Jersey Chapter, Public Relations Society of America; Harry P. Frank, Publisher, The Daily Journal; John J. Conlon, Vice President, Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corporation; John Mossey, President, Wayne Steel Company; Honorable Richard R. O'Connor, O'Connor, Morss & O'Connor, General Counsel for Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc.; J. Kenneth Roden, Executive Vice President, Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc.

PRIORITIES TO REALIZE FULL POTENTIAL OF OPERATION NOVA SCOTIA

Our Junior Achievement companies must get off to a very good start this year with practical, top quality products which will sell well. Attendance must continue at a very good rate. Operation Nova Scotia is designed to help you maintain this momentum of production and sales, and the enthusiastic participation of every Junior Achiever and Adviser. It will help your Junior Achievement company meet and maintain our Performance Standards.

Start now to prepare for Operation Nova Scotia.

Review this bulletin carefully and announce Operation Nova Scotia to your JA company members.

Tell your top management executives and your company publications editor about Operation Nova Scotia and review this bulletin with them in detail. Make sure they realize the potential for good employee and community relations through participation in this youth incentive and economic education project.

Remember: A successful Operation Nova Scotia program can help you earn the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce Free Enterprise Award for your company, and the Management Award for your Junior Achievement Company.

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. O'HARA of Illinois, for 1 hour, on February 15, on the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. WOLFF, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ST GERMAIN), for 60 minutes, on January 25, 1967.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ST GERMAIN), for 60 minutes, on February 16, 1967.

Mr. QUILLEN (at the request of Mr. MIZE), for 30 minutes, on January 18.

Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. MIZE), for 30 minutes, on January 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MIZE) and to revise and extend his remarks:)

Mr. AYRES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ST GERMAIN) and to revise and extend their remarks:)

Mr. REES.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. MINISH.

Mrs. KELLY in two instances.

Mr. GATHINGS.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution authorizing the President to establish a "National Ski Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 19, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

224. A letter from the Director, Legislative Commission, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 48th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Washington, D.C., August 31–September 1, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 77–249 (H. Doc. No. 39); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

225. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions, according certain beneficiaries' third preference and sixth preference classifications, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

226. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 81–686; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

227. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933 (46 U.S.C. 845); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

228. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 26, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Insley Cove, Md., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 3, 1959; to the Committee on Public Works.

229. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 6, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Baraboo River, Wis., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 10, 1962; to the Committee on Public Works.

230. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 6, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Stumpy Point Bay, N.C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 31, 1957. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

231. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 6, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Bonum Creek, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted September 26, 1963. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

232. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 21, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on a survey of Jefferson-St. Charles Parish Line Canal, La., authorized by Public Law 85–832, approved August 28, 1958, including a survey of Lake Pontchartrain, La., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 14, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

233. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 14, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on channel between Point Shirley and Deer Island, Mass., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved October 23, 1962; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 2764. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2765. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 2766. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer an amortized deduction from gross income for assessments for depreciable property levied by soil or water conservation or drainage districts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2768. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 2769. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Biscayne National Monument in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 2770. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 2771. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2772. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2774. A bill to amend the Copyright Act by repealing the jukebox exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2775. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2776. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent, across-the-board benefit increase, and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 2777. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2778. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 2779. A bill to amend section 124 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the financing of advance acquisition of rights-of-way for the Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2780. A bill authorizing the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, to expend certain appropriated funds to maintain harbors and waterways at depths required for defense purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2781. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 2782. A bill to specify the insignia of grade for certain enlisted members of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 2783. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2784. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent, across-the-board benefit increase, with a minimum primary benefit of $100 a month, and to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 2785. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for a method of designating U.S. ports for export of commodities donated abroad; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2786. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2787. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2788. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2789. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and disability insurance benefits by $35 a month (and other monthly benefits proportionately), and to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 62 and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 2790. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 2791. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to revise the rates of postage on third-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 2792. A bill to amend sections 281 and 344 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the statutory prescription of fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2793. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2794. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the memory of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 2795. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2796. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to provide for a method of certification and regulation with respect to certain transportation performed with hovercraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2797. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to enforce the duty imposed on each carrier to provide adequate services in connection with the transportation authorized by its certificate of public convenience and necessity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2798. A bill to provide that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall not undertake certain projects to improve or expand Federal airports without specific authorization for such projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2799. A bill to establish the position of U.S. customs inspector (nonsupervisory) in the Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, to place such position in grade 10 of the Classification Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2800. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child-welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2801. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include prescribed drugs among the items and services covered under the supplementary medical insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2802. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for optional tax tables where the adjusted gross income is less than $10,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2803. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer including the exemptions for a spouse and dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 2804. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase to $25,000 the amount of servicemen's group life insurance which may be carried by members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2805. A bill to amend section 47 of title 28, United States Code, to provide means for the disqualification of circuit judges for bias or prejudice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2806. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 2807. A bill to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2808. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to the operation of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 2809. A bill to amend the veterans' educational assistance program of title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the amount of educational assistance allowances payable to veterans under the veterans' educational assistance program in that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 2810. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 2811. A bill for the education and training of the handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2812. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent benefit increase, to provide a minimum $100 a month benefit for certain individuals with 25 years service, to liberalize the retirement test, to provide health insurance benefits for individuals entitled to disability insurance benefits, to increase the earnings base for benefit and tax purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 2813. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 2814. A bill to extend the time for filing manufacturers' claims for floor stocks refunds with respect to automobile parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 2815. A bill to authorize grants to States for assistance to homeowners and businesses suffering property losses as a result of riots or other civil disturbances; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2816. A bill to protect consumers, homebuilders, building material suppliers, lumber manufacturers, and others against false grade marking of lumber, to promote interstate commerce in lumber, to strengthen the standards program of the lumber industry, and to promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2817. 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.

H.R. 2818. A bill relating to dealings in good faith between parties to franchise agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 2819. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the control of noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2820. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 2821. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 to provide additional dental care for dependents of active duty members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2822. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 2823. A bill relating to the composition of the State agricultural stabilization and conservation committee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2824. A bill to provide that the widow of a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who married such officer or member after his retirement may qualify for survivor benefits; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2825. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include prescribed drugs among the items and services covered under the supplementary medical insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 2826. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 2827. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 2828. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Iowa Tribes of Kansas and Nebraska and of Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 138, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2829. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 2830. A bill to postpone the application of daylight-saving provisions of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in certain States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 2831. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2832. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 2833. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent, across-the-board benefit increase, and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 2834. A bill to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to the participation of the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2835. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 2836. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act in order to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 2837. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 2838. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize, under certain conditions, travel and transportation allowances for members of the uniformed services in connection with emergency leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 2839. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2840. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 2841. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By. Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 2842. A bill to provide annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund for certain widows and widowers by reducing the required period of marriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 2843. A bill to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 2844. A bill authorizing the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, to expend certain appropriated funds to maintain harbors and waterways at depths required for defense purposes to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2845. A bill to provide uniform, fair, and equitable treatment of persons, businesses, or farms displaced by Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 2846. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the security of the United States by providing penalties for interference with defense security systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 2847. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2848. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment to an individual for the charges made by physicians and other persons providing services covered by the supplementary medical insurance program prior to such individual's own payment of the bill for the services involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 2849. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 2850. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 2851. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 2852. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2853. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 2854. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2855. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 2856. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 2857. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 2858. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 2859. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2860. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 2861. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 2862. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 2863. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 2864. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 2865. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 2866. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2867. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 2868. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 2869. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 2870. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 2871. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 2872. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 2873. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 2874. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 2875. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 2876. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 2877. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 2878. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 2879. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 2880. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 2881. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 2882. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 2883. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 2884. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization and Administration of Federal Social Programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 2885. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations that certain railroad vehicles be equipped with reflectors or luminous material so that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2886. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2887. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of certain machines for sorting agricultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2888. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Michigan among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2889. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to provide an exemption for county fairs and other agricultural or horticultural fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2890. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 2891. A bill to designate the Buck Creek Dam and Reservoir proposed for construction on Buck Creek near Springfield, Clark County, Ohio, as the Clarence J. Brown Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 2892. A bill to establish a National Commission on Older Workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2893. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer or a labor organization to discriminate unjustifiably on account of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2894. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2895. A bill to amend section 57n (11 U.S.C. 93n) of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2896. A bill to establish a Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 2897. A bill to equalize the retirement benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are retired for permanent total disability; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 2898. A bill to authorize the procurement of patent licenses and the consideration of royalties payable under such licenses in evaluating competing bids or offers in situations where, after formal advertising for bids or solicitation of negotiated offers, an allegation of patent infringement is received by the contracting officer; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 2899. A bill to authorize a program of research, development, and demonstration of electrically powered vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 2900. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal revenues with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 2901. A bill to designate the Oahe Reservoir on the Missouri River in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota as Lake Oahe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 2902. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2903. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2904. A bill to amend sections 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2905. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2906. A bill to specify the number of hospital beds that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs must maintain and operate at the veterans' hospital, East Orange, N.J.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2907. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 2908. A bill making a supplemental appropriation to carry out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2909. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 2910. A bill to enlarge the classes of persons eligible for servicemen's group life insurance, and to improve the administration of the program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 2911. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national historic park on the island of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 2912. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway for Mobile, Ala., to Fulton, Ky., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2913. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway from Birmingham Ala., to Memphis, Tenn., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 2914. A bill to establish a Commission on Trading Stamp Practices to provide for the regulation of trading stamp companies and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 2915. A bill to establish a Commission on Trading Stamp Practices to provide for the regulation of trading stamp companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.J. Res. 166. 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. DOLE:

H.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of April 1967 as National Residence Hall Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 168. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday of October in every year as National Choir Recognition Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.J. Res. 170. Joint resolution to direct the Librarian of Congress to transfer certain documents to the Hall of Records Commission of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 171. 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.

H.J. Res. 172. Joint resolution designating the Sunday before Labor Day in each year as National Traffic Accident Prevention Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.J. Res. 173. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize Congress to limit the power of courts of the United States to determine that statutes of the United States or of any State are repugnant to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the third week in April in every year as National Coin Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for representation in the Congress for the District constituting the seat of government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.J. Res. 177. 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. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 179. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Federal control of public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to provide for the resumption of trade with Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 182. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National CARIH Asthma Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.J. Res. 183. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution: Objective—a just peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the State of New York should raise its legal drinking age to 21; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROCK:

H. Res. 145. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H. Res. 146. Resolution to amend rules X, XI, and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 147. Resolution to amend rules X, XI, and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H. Res. 148. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to change the name of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H. Res. 149. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to change the name of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KARTH:

H. Res. 150. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H. Res. 151. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 152. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 153. Resolution to include drum and bugle corps under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER:

H. Res. 154. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. Res. 155. Resolution to provide a residence for pages; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 156. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Inquiry which shall have no legislative jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 157. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Fiscal Organization and Procedures of the Congress; 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. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Maria Giovanna Trombino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2917. A bill for the relief of Antonio Liberti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2918. A bill for the relief of Arturo Cortina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Stefano Liparoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2920. A bill for the relief of Salvatore LoVerde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2921. A bill for the relief of Enoch C. L. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2922. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Vito Bono and their children, Salvatore Bono and Serafina Bono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2923. A bill for the relief of Tevfik M. Gokcebay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2924. A bill for the relief of Rammurt Mishra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Edith Estella Rose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2926. A bill for the relief of Bartolomeo Calia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2927. A bill for the relief of Settimo Li Mandri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2928. A bill for the relief of Donovan Herbert Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2929. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Sodano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2930. A bill for the relief of David Anthony De Beauville; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2931. A bill for the relief of Valerie and Benjamin Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2932. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Frisina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2933. A bill for the relief of Horace

W. Sessing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2934. A bill for the relief of Winston Nurse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2935. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Puglisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2936. A bill for the relief of Francesco Fidilio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2937. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Longo; to the Committee on the Juidiciary.

H.R. 2938. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cracchiolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2939. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe DiGiovanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2940. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Michelangelo Richiusa and their minor child, Maria Rosa Richiusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2941. A bill for the relief of Paraskevi and Christos Basile Manolakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2942. A bill for the relief of Georgia Christos Manolakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2943. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Badalamenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2944. A bill for the relief of Michael Buscemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2945. A bill for the relief of Gaetana Battaglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2946. A bill for the relief of Sharlotta and Wolf Gniazdo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2947. A bill for the relief of Spiridon Andreadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2948. A bill for the relief of Margherita Di Matteo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2949. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Vogioso and wife, Giulia Giovanna Gisotti Voglioso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2950. A bill for the relief of Tommaso Marsiglia (Massiglia); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2951. A bill for the relief of Rosa Di Giovanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2952. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Mastropieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2953. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Naso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2954. A bill for the relief of Filomena Luigia Montanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2955. A bill for the relief of Angelo Duca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2956. A bill for the relief of Rosaria Grippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2957. A bill for the relief of Remedios Remigio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2958. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Colombo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2959. A bill for the relief of Caterina Caliendo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2960. A bill for the relief of Maria Lozza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 2961. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Abruscato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2962. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angela C. Alexan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 2963. A bill for the relief of David Man-Kwang Tseng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2964. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2965. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sharadha Viswanathan and her children, Usha Viswanathan and Meera Viswanathan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2966. A bill for the relief of Marara Potete Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2967. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hatsue Taniguchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2968. A bill for the relief of Vilis Lapenieks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2969. A bill for the relief of Agustina Felipe Fiesta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2970. A bill for the relief of Houston Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 2971. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Caleca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 2972. A bill for the relief of Lucie Anne Violo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2973. A bill for the relief of Peter D. Wu, his wife, Wu Chen Lee-Jin, and their minor children, Wu I-Lin and Wu I-Wun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2974. A bill for the relief of Adelina Del Barrio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 2975. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Hassan Sadek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2976. A bill for the relief of Mutual Benefit Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 2977. A bill for the relief of Antonino Laviano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2978. A bill for the relief of Yong Ok Espantoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2979. A bill for the relief of Maria and Andreas Tselos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2980. A bill for the relief of Alvaro Carlos Carreras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 2981. A bill for the relief of Miss Teodora Guillamon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 2982. A bill for the relief of Chaplain Edward J. Kucera; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2983. A bill for the relief of Antonio Sguera (also known as Tony Galante); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2984. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Flora El Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2985. A bill for the relief of Dr. Olga J. Agbayani Asar and Dr. Sadat Ali Asar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2986. A bill for the relief of Irene Kehayias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 2987. A bill for the relief of Miss Jalileh Farah Salameh El Ahwal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2988. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angela (Angelina) Merola Squitieri and daughter, Ida Squitieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2989. A bill for the relief of Lilia Medroso Benaid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2990. A bill for the relief of Mario Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2991. A bill for the relief of Carmen Dato Castillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2992. A bill for the relief of Lolita T. Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 2993. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Maturo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2994. A bill for the relief of Helena Iniewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 2995. A bill for the relief of Stamatios Stelatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2996. A bill for the relief of Rosette Hamaoui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2997. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Jean Petrou and Rachel Arbib Harari Petrou, husband and wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2998. A bill for the relief of Timothy Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2999. A bill for the relief of Domenico Duca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3000. A bill for the relief of Dr. Virginia Valenzula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 3001. A bill for the relief of Mary Ednal Younie; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3002. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dora Maben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 3003. A bill for the relief of Marjorie E. Woodward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3004. A bill for the relief of Laudalina D. F. Pereira; to the Commmittee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3005. A bill for the relief of Horacio Perira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3006. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Boscarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aranka Mlinko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3008. A bill for the relief of Antonina Mandracchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3009. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ivan Dimich and his wife, Dr. Aleksandra Bajsanski Dimich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 3010. A bill for the relief of Maria Calderon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3011. A bill for the relief of Genowefa Iwanowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3012. A bill for the relief of Rufino Tomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3013. A bill for the relief of Irene Mercedes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3014. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Crescensia Virtudes Escobido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3015. A bill for the relief of Michael Stephen Valeriote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3016. A bill for the relief of Ram Johl Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3017. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Kalin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3018. A bill for the relief of Luciano Vighi, Oliba Vighi, and Claudio Vighi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3019. A bill for the relief of Gwendolyn Dodsley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3020. A bill for the relief of Gorgonio B. Policar, Jr., doctor of medicine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3021. A bill for the relief of Faustino M. Gayo, doctor of medicine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 3022. A bill for the relief of Dr. Haroon M. Qazi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3023. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor D. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3024. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benjamin Cruz Atanacio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3025. A bill for the relief of Anton Sobonja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3026. A bill for the relief of Dr. Siddiq Nabi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3027. A bill for the relief of Maria Guida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3028. A bill for the relief of Bahram Ravan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 3029. A bill to provide for the free entry of one ship model for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 3030. A bill for the relief of Soon Choi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 3031. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christos Photinos-Svoronos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3032. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Karen Wood Davila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3033. A bill for the relief of Miss Hea Ja Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3034. A bill for the relief of Antonio Lora and his wife, Angela Columna de Lora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3035. A bill for the relief of Claudio Silvestri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 3036. A bill to permit the vessel *Janice Vee* to be documented for use in the fisheries and coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 3037. A bill for the relief of Syed Hashim Reza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 3038. A bill for the relief of Daniel Marin Macias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 3039. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chul Nam Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3040. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hae Kyong Han, and her minor children, Myong Suk Lee, Ki Dong Lee, Kyong Dong Lee, and Myong Dong Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 3041. A bill for the relief of Hiroshi Nakao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1967

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 12, 1967)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whose peace our restless spirits are quieted, take Thou the dimness of our souls away, help Thy servants in this Chamber of governance to lift the difficult decisions of the public service into Thy holy light.

Grant us inner greatness of spirit, purity of heart, and clearness of vision, to meet and match the vast designs of this changing, demanding day, which even across this shaken earth is marching on to its coronation in the affairs of men.

Gird us to meet with the might of righteousness and justice the massed forces of evil loose in the world—

"That we may tell our sons who see the light
High in the heavens, their heritage to take,
I saw the powers of darkness put to flight,
I saw the morning break."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 17, 1967, was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

PROPOSED VISIT OF PRESIDENT EDUARDO FREI OF CHILE TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional minute or so beyond the 3-minute limitation.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is not usual for me to comment on political developments in governments of friendly nations. On yesterday, however, a disturbing event occurred in Santiago de Chile which seems to bear a most unfortunate relationship to this Nation.

According to press reports, the Cabinet of President Eduardo Frei sought to resign en bloc in apparent protest of a decision of the Chilean Senate not to give the President permission to visit the United States next month. This refusal, I regret to note, has been generally interpreted as an expression of antagonism toward the United States.

I hope, Mr. President, that that is not the case. There do not appear to be any questions in United States-Chilean relations which are so heated as to bring about an action of this kind, and if there were, the action would be even more inexplicable. After all, our two countries are not strangers. We have lived together and worked together in this hemisphere for a long time. Whatever difficulties there may be in Chilean-United States relations, they will hardly be resolved by indirection, by inferred expressions of displeasure or hostility. They will be met, may I say most respectfully to my Senate colleagues in Santiago, by an honest coming together, by a direct confrontation of views, by a measure of mutual forbearance which is to be expected in the light of the long and peaceful association of Chile and the United States in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere.

That attitude, I had assumed, was expected to prevail as a basis for the scheduled visit of President Frei with President Johnson in February. On the part of the United States, may I say, the invitation to President Frei was primarily an expression of friendship and respect for the people of Chile and their institutions. It would also, of course, have provided a setting for a frank discussion. Quite apart from any other effects, therefore, the cancellation of the visit will represent a lost opportunity for such a discussion. That is regrettable, for both Chile and the United States.

Mr. President, this situation is most unusual in that it involves not only the United States and Chile but also colleagues in the Senate of a friendly country. I have felt free, therefore, to direct my remarks to the latter on a matter which is probably of more direct concern to the diplomats of both countries. I trust that my comments on the situation will not be deemed offensive in any manner to the Chilean Senators.

In all humility, I ask my peers in Chile whether it would be possible to reconsider the question, so that the meeting of the two Presidents may take place as planned. I reiterate, all problems of Chilean-United States relations are soluble if we face them and each other in honesty and forbearance. None can be resolved if we turn back to back in anger.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have my 3 minutes now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The Senator may.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to say to the Senator from Montana that I believe this is one of the finest things he has ever done in the Senate.

I know the Chilean situation personally. I was there more than once. Indeed, I was the senior official present, on the ground, in the political crisis that brought President Frei to the point where he could be elected, which was 3 years ago. I know something about the