

be printed again—although it is in the RECORD previously, but it is brief and gives the meaning and purport of the Goldwater statement in the resolution to which it is directed—the very brief reservation I have proposed which is scheduled for a vote late in the afternoon of Wednesday next week, known as Executive Reservation No. 2. It is to that reservation that the Associated Press story just off the wire alludes.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON (AP).—Barry Goldwater, who previously said he supports the U.S.-Soviet Consular Treaty, came out today for an amendment which the pact's supporters say would kill it.

Goldwater, in a statement issued through Karl Hess, speechwriter in the former Senator's unsuccessful 1964 campaign for the presidency, said he supports a proposed amendment by Sen. Karl E. Mundt, R-S.D.

The Mundt proposal would postpone effectiveness of the treaty until the President is able to notify Congress that U.S. troops are no longer needed in Vietnam or until he certifies that Soviet aid to North Vietnam is not delaying the return of such troops.

Backers of the pact, now before the Senate, contend Russia would accept no such amendment and the agreement on guidelines for the opening of new consulates in each country would be torpedoed.

"To oppose the amendment would be the same as saying that Soviet support of the killing of our soldiers is of no consequence in the relations between America and the Soviet Union," Goldwater said. "I know that the American people feel that it is of great consequence. They would, given the opportunity to vote on it, support Sen. Mundt's amendment enthusiastically, as I do."

"Recently, I said that I would, if still in the Senate, support Sen. (Everett M.) Dirksen's position in over-all support of the consular treaty. As I publicly explained, my reasons for taking that position, after originally opposing the treaty, involve matters of highest national security which I am not free to disclose."

RESERVATION

Before the period at the end of the resolution of ratification insert a comma and the following: "Subject to the reservation that no exchange of instruments of ratification of this Convention shall be entered into on behalf of the United States, and the Convention shall not enter into force, until the President determines and reports to the Congress that (1) it is no longer necessary to assign members of the Armed Forces of the United States to perform combat duties in the defense of South Vietnam or (2) the removal of members of the Armed Forces of the United States from South Vietnam is not being prevented or delayed because of military assistance furnished North Vietnam by the Soviet Union."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order of March 9, 1967, that the Senate, in executive session, stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 13, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 10, 1967:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

George M. Stafford, of Kansas, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1973, vice Howard G. Freas, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.—Matthew 5: 10.

O God and Father of us all, who art in heaven and in earth, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and offer unto Thee the devotion of our hearts. We come because we need Thee, every hour we need Thee. Temptations lose their power when Thou art near, bitterness fades away in Thy presence, resentments lose their weight, and we are given courage to stand for what we believe to be right.

Grant unto us Thy spirit as we in quietness lift our hearts in prayer unto Thee. If we are criticized because of the stand we take, if we are misunderstood in our decisions, may we not let the disagreements of others make us disagreeable, nor may we allow a difference of opinion to make a difference in relationships, but through it all help us to keep our faith in Thee and in righteousness, justice, and good will. Thus may Thy kingdom come in us and through us begin to come in all men. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 9, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the supplemental defense appropriation bill, 1967.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. LIPSCOMB reserved all points of order on the bill.)

REQUEST FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO SIT TODAY WHILE THE HOUSE IS ENGAGED IN GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be allowed to sit during the deliberations of the House on legislative business today during general debate.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been approved by the ranking minority member?

Mr. WHITE. I may say that the ranking minority member is sitting to the right of the committee chairman and they have been deliberating on the Colorado River Basin bill today. They have many witnesses from out of the district or the State. But I presume that it has been.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The usual procedure is for the majority leader to ask for such permission, and we have an arrangement that when he does not ask, to ascertain and to ask if it has been cleared with the minority member.

I am only inquiring for the purposes of the RECORD and am not doubting that he would agree to it. I am only inquiring if his permission has been obtained.

Mr. WHITE. I was asked to make the request. But I do not know. I presume that they did agree.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman to withdraw his request for the time being?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

CITIZEN SPEAKS OUT

Mr. PATMAN. 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. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Robert M. Harriss, a native of Texas now residing in New York, has sent me a statement of his views concerning the serious foreign and domestic problems that this Nation is experiencing today. I have long appreciated and valued Bob Harriss' judgments. In the spirit of Texas Independence Day, March 2, Bob Harriss has forwarded me his views on some of our current problems, and I would like to put some of them in the RECORD.

In the preface of his statement, Mr. Harriss comments:

I believe that the present most serious situation and the problems confronting our country are due to our foreign policy over the past fifty years. Without a sound for-

sign policy, we cannot have a sound national or domestic policy. . . .

We cannot put all the blame on the present administration for these most serious problems, as they have been accumulating over the past fifty years by mistakes of previous administrations.

Mr. Harriss further correctly outlines the facts concerning our huge Federal debt. The bulk of this \$330 billion is remaining debt of the World Wars with its vast accumulation of interest that we today must bear. I am happy that Mr. Harriss brings out President Lincoln's policy in financing the Government's war effort.

Lincoln faced a similar monetary situation and won the war and saved the Union by issuing about five hundred million dollars of "greenbacks," most of which (\$350 million) are still in circulation and have saved the nation more than sixty billion dollars in interest compounded at five per cent and still rendering a most valuable service to the country.

Robert Harriss' views are explicit and forthright. I rise today to praise his independence and expression of his views.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE POSITION ON ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. TEAGUE of California. 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. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our new Attorney General was interviewed on one of the national TV network programs. As a whole, I thought he did very well, but I was quite surprised and shocked by one statement he made.

He was asked by one of the interviewers what the Department of Justice proposed to do about Adam Clayton Powell. He replied to the effect, "Well, really, there is no real hurry about it, and we have got to wait and see what Congress does."

We all know that Congress is being represented by independent counsel on any constitutional issues involved.

For the life of me, I cannot see any possible connection between, on the one hand, decisions by the House to seat or exclude Adam Clayton Powell and, on the other, decisions by the Department of Justice as to whether he should be proceeded against for misusing public funds.

After all, my predecessor, a Republican Congressman, Ernest Bramblett of California, was proceeded against, prosecuted by a Republican Department of Justice, and was found guilty.

I believe there is no excuse why the Department of Justice should not investigate this matter thoroughly and proceed to do so promptly.

RECOVERING INVESTMENT IN NATO FACILITIES

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States have invested \$1 billion in various facilities in France in order to help provide for the common defense of France and Western Europe. Because of the position taken by the De Gaulle government, we must abandon those facilities. Only 18 days remain wherein we may recover some of the residual value. I suggest the State Department should utilize these 18 days to work out further agreements to protect in some way the financial interest of America.

The outcome of yesterday of the French elections make it all the more imperative that we act now to protect our taxpayers from the loss of the residual value of \$643 million worth of U.S.-funded installations and \$300 million worth of NATO installations, built with our taxpayers' money.

The American people's right to recover the residual value of property constructed in France with American funds was clearly established in our early agreements with the French Government.

However, investigation of this situation by a subcommittee of the other body, as reported to the Congress on January 30, shows that the interest of American taxpayers have not been adequately protected in agreements relating to the construction of facilities in France.

Judging from past experience, I doubt if the American Government will be able to extract any worthwhile agreements in the time remaining, but certainly every effort should be made to reach some sort of understanding. Since it is De Gaulle's decision that America abandon these NATO bases, America should not leave these facilities behind with no effort whatsoever to make the French Government live up to its obligations.

I suggest also, Mr. Speaker, that the failure of the State Department and Defense Department to adequately protect taxpayers' interests relating to installations built in France raises some serious questions about whether our right to recover residual values in other countries, where we have bases, are being protected.

THE NO. 1 BASKETBALL TEAM IN THE SOUTHEASTERN CONFERENCE—THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Mr. DUNCAN. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, with pride I call to the attention of my colleagues the No. 1 basketball team in the Southeastern Conference—the University of Tennessee.

Playing against heavy odds, these young men once again showed cooperation and a spirit that long ago named Tennessee the Volunteer State. Wrote Marvin West in the Knoxville News-Sentinel:

They laughed, they cried and they jumped for joy . . . and finally they paused and offered a prayer of thanksgiving. The happiest basketball players in the whole world last night were the Volunteers of Tennessee, undisputed champions of the Southeastern Conference.

We Tennesseans are very proud of the University of Tennessee and its students who have a challenging academic program and the encouragement to pursue physical fitness. We are fortunate to have on the staff of our university one of the country's finest basketball coaches, Ray Mears.

I congratulate Ray and his coworkers on a good season.

Setting a record all his own was the Vol captain, Ron Widby, of Knoxville. He has led his team through the best season in UT basketball history.

Perhaps the Knoxville Journal best captured the attitude of Vol fans in this editorial statement:

Few experiences in life are as inspiring and rewarding as the winning of a goal, particularly when that goal, at the outset, appeared to be far beyond reach.

The University of Tennessee basketball team has delighted our hearts by achieving such a goal. Given little chance at the start of the season, the Vols won the 1966-67 Southeastern Conference championship with a display of effort and dedication that has brought the team and the University countless new fans.

To the team's excellent coach, Ray Mears, his colleagues and his players, we join all other Vol fans in saying, Well Done. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that the next goal, the NCAA championship, may also prove to be within reach of these remarkable young men.

DREW PEARSON

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. President, there is an increasing tendency these days among an element of journalists who are not worthy of the honorable title, to assassinate by smear, innuendo, and with a distorted telling of a portion of a story. One of the most nefarious practitioners of this questionable art is Drew Pearson who is aided and abetted by his equally guilty partner, Jack Anderson.

Writers like Pearson and Anderson take advantage of the tendency of many people to regard what they read in print as the gospel truth, which, of course, it is not. I do not know the answer to how writers of this type can be controlled, but I do know that something has to be done to show the public what irresponsible people they are. One way I can help in this fight to preserve men's character is to call attention to a book called

"The Drew Pearson Story," written by Frank Kluckhohn and J. Franklin. It is published by Charles Hallberg & Co., of Chicago. I urge everyone to read this book so that they will have a better insight into the twisted minds of Pearson and Anderson and be on their guard whenever they read anything attributed to either of them.

Forewarned is forearmed and in dealing with character assassins like these two, the people need all the ammunition they can get. I commend this book to the attention of every Member.

If nothing else, this book proves what is always true, that there are two sides to every story. Too often, Pearson and Anderson give us only one and a distorted one at that.

THE PRESIDENT'S PATH TO PEACE IN VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, President Johnson again demonstrated to the Congress and the people of the world at his recent press conference that he does not intend to swerve from his intent of achieving a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. Yet he believes that a sign of firm intent to negotiate has not been received from our enemies in that war-torn country.

The President has sent Government emissaries around the world seeking every possibility to negotiate. He sent messengers of peace to far points of the globe to stress that we are ready to talk. And he has used the great military and economic power of the United States with restraint and judgment in Vietnam. For he knows that the strong must be wise and prudent in a world filled with conflict.

President Johnson said recently that he goes to bed each night feeling he has failed because peace had not come to Vietnam. I say that if that is failure, it is a failure of the other side—not ours. It takes two to negotiate.

The President has said that he would go anywhere at any time on the shortest notice to talk peace—and without preconditions. This the enemy has refused to do. So the President must persist, and we must support him in his persistence. The President of the United States cannot run out on freedom. We should not run out on the President of the United States.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

may sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

"PANCHITO" AND HEADSTART

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, too often we hear of "what's wrong" with our country, "what's wrong" with the Congress, "what's wrong" with our programs. We hear so much of "what's wrong" that I thought it would be a happy interlude to bring to your attention a "what's right" item.

This morning, our gracious First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, had a movie star at the White House for a celebration and a private showing of his first movie. His name is "Pancho"—more formally it is Frank Mansera, and he is 5 years old. He comes from San Luis Obispo, Calif., where he lives with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Simon Mansera.

Who is this famous movie star? He is just another American kid who was helped by our Headstart program. People thought Pancho was retarded. But he just needed a little bit of help. Now he is an alert normal youngster, and this movie tells his story, and the story of our Headstart program.

In this connection, also, I had in my office an old schoolmate, Prof. Gonzalo Garza and his wife, of Corpus Christi, Tex. He is in charge of Headstart for that city. Mr. Garza has done such a wonderful job that Mrs. Johnson invited him up for the ceremonies.

The story is the same everywhere you go—what a good program, what a wonderful program, what a successful program. Forgive me, Mr. Speaker, for breaking the trend but, by golly, I thought you would like to hear at least a little bit of "what's right."

THE LATIN AMERICAN SUMMIT MEETING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 84)

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present to hear this message from the President.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 34]

Abbitt	Friedel	Passman
Adair	Fulton, Tenn.	Pelly
Ashbrook	Galifianakis	Pettis
Ashley	Gardner	Pirnie
Aspinall	Gubser	Poage
Baring	Haley	Pool
Bolton	Hanna	Resnick
Bow	Heckler, Mass.	Rhodes, Pa.
Brademas	Helstoski	Riegle
Brown, Calif.	Herlong	Rivers
Burton, Utah	Hollifield	Ronan
Cahill	Howard	Rostenkowski
Clancy	Ichord	Roybal
Clausen,	Irwin	St Germain
Don H.	Jacobs	Shipley
Cleveland	Karh	Sisk
Conyers	Kluczynski	Smith, N.Y.
Corman	Kupferman	Steed
Cramer	Long, La.	Stephens
Daddario	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Dellenback	Madden	Watkins
Dent	May	Whalley
Derwinski	Michel	Williams, Miss.
Diggs	Minshall	Willis
Dow	Moorhead	Winn
Downing	Morton	Wright
Ellberg	Mosher	Zablocki
Fallon	Nix	Zion
Farbstein	O'Konski	
Fino	Ottlinger	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 344 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

THE LATIN AMERICAN SUMMIT MEETING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 84)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In less than a month, the leaders of the American states will meet in Punta del Este in Uruguay.

It will be the first such meeting in a decade, and the second ever held, of the heads of the free nations of our hemisphere system.

This meeting represents another link in the bond of partnership which joins us with more than 230 million neighbors to the south.

The gathering is far more than a symbol of flourishing friendship. Its purpose is a review of the progress we have made together in a great adventure which unites the destinies of all of us. Beyond that it will include a common commitment to the historic and humane next steps we plan to take together.

I look to this meeting with enthusiasm. The peaceful and progressive revolution which is transforming Latin America is one of the great inspirational movements of our time. Our participation in that revolution is a worthy enterprise blending our deepest national traditions with our most responsible concepts of hemispheric solidarity.

THE MEASURE OF PROGRESS

The cooperative spirit between the rest of the Americas and the United States has been building for decades.

The establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank in 1959, and the Act of Bogotá in 1960, under the leadership of President Eisenhower, helped turn that spirit to substance. In those historic compacts the American governments pledged their joint efforts to the development of programs to improve the lives of all the people of Latin America. They provided the impetus for an action taken in 1961 on which the history of the hemisphere has since turned. That action—the Alliance for Progress, which moved dramatically forward under President Kennedy—fused old dreams and fired new hopes. With its commitment of mutual assistance and self-help programs, it attacked evils as old as the condition of man—hunger, ignorance, and disease.

That Alliance is now 6 years old.

What can we say of it?

We can say that there is a clear record of progress. Per capita growth rates for Latin America show that more countries have broken the economic stagnation of earlier years. Reform and modernization are advancing as a new wave of managers and technicians apply their skills. There have been steady gains in private, national, and foreign investments. Inflation is easing. The struggle for social justice is proceeding.

These are all true. But the statements of progress are more meaningful, and they more realistically reflect the spirit of the Alliance, when they relate to the people for whose lives the Alliance itself was created. Since the Alliance began, and with the funds that we have contributed:

Men, women, and children are alive today who would otherwise have died.

One hundred million people are being protected from malaria. In 10 countries, deaths caused by malaria dropped from 10,810 to 2,280 in 3 years' time. Smallpox cases declined almost as sharply.

Twelve hundred health centers, including hospitals and mobile medical units, are in operation or soon will be.

For tens of thousands of families, the most fundamental conditions of life are improving.

Three hundred fifty thousand housing units have been, or are now being built.

Two thousand rural wells and 1,170 portable water supply systems have been built to benefit some 20 million persons.

Children are going to school now who would not have gone before.

Primary school enrollments have increased by 23 percent; secondary school enrollments by 50 percent; university enrollments by 39 percent.

Twenty-eight thousand classrooms have been built.

One hundred sixty thousand teachers have been trained or given additional training.

More than 14 million textbooks have been distributed.

Thirteen million schoolchildren and 3 million preschoolers participate in school lunch programs.

Men whose fathers for generations have worked land owned by others now work it as their own.

Sixteen countries have legislation dealing directly with land reform.

With U.S. assistance, 1.1 million acres have been irrigated and 106,000 acres reclaimed.

More than 700,000 agricultural loans have benefitted 3.5 million people.

Fifteen thousand miles of road have been built or improved, many of them farm-to-market access roads.

All of these are heartening facts. But they are only the beginning of the story, and only part of it. Statistics can only suggest the deep human meaning of hope alive now where once none lived. Statistics cannot report the wonder of a child born into a world which will give him a chance to break through the tyranny of indifference which doomed generations before him to lives of bleakness and want and misery.

Nor can they reveal the revolution which has come about in the minds of tens of millions of people when they saw that their own efforts, combined with those of their governments and their friends abroad, could change their lives for the better.

Perhaps most important of all, statistics cannot adequately reflect the emergence of a vigorous, competent, and confident new generation of Latin American leaders. These men are determined to see realized in their own time a strong, modern Latin America, loyal to its own traditions and history. They are men who know that rhetoric and resolutions are no substitute for sustained hard work.

And statistics can never tell us what might have been. They cannot record the shots which might have rung out in the avenidas and plazas of a dozen Latin American cities, but did not—or the howls of angry crowds which might have formed, but did not. The full success of the Alliance for Progress must be sought not only in what has been accomplished but in what has been avoided as well.

Ferment gripped the hemisphere when the Alliance was born. In places throughout the world, terror with its bloodshed sought to redress ancient evils. And in some of these places—in Cuba and half a world away in southeast Asia—even greater evil followed the thrust of violence. Through their own efforts under the Alliance for Progress, the Latin Americans have transformed the hemisphere into a region of determination and hope.

The U.S. participation in the Alliance was a bold affirmation of its belief that the true revolution which betters men's lives can be effected peacefully. The Alliance's 6-year record of accomplishments is history's clear testament to the validity of that belief.

It is also a testament to the validity of the underlying principle of self-help. Our support has been vitally important to the successes so far achieved. But the commitments and dedication of the Latin American nations themselves to these tasks has been the keystone of that success.

THE TASK BEFORE US

The record of progress only illuminates the work which still must be done if life for the people of this hemisphere

is truly to improve—not just for today, but for the changing years ahead.

Last August, in a statement on the fifth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, I described the challenge in these terms:

If present trends continue, the population of this hemisphere will be almost 1 billion by the year 2000. Two-thirds—some 625 million—will live in Latin America. Whatever may be done through programs to reduce the rate of population growth, Latin America faces a vast challenge.

Farm production, for instance, should increase by 6 percent every year, and that will be double the present rate.

At least 140 million new jobs will need to be created.

Over a million new homes should be built each year.

More than 175,000 new doctors need to be trained to meet the very minimum requirements.

Hundreds of thousands of new classrooms should be constructed.

And annual per capita growth rates should increase to the range of 4 to 6 percent.

These requirements, added to the demands of the present, mean that new sights must be set, that new directions and renewed drive must be found if we are to meet the challenge, if we are to move forward.

It is with these sober problems confronting us that the leaders of the American states will meet at Punta del Este.

PILLARS OF PROGRESS

Our governments have been hard at work for months preparing for this meeting.

Our concern has centered on the question of how we can speed the development process in Latin America. We know that growth and trade are interacting forces. We know that they depend on the free movement of products, people, and capital. We know they depend on people who are healthy and educated. We know that these conditions contain the seeds of prosperity for all of us.

Further, based on our joint experience so far under the Alliance, we know that the future progress of the hemisphere must rest on four strong pillars:

1. ELIMINATION OF BARRIERS TO TRADE

Civilization in most of Latin America followed along the coastal rim of the continent. Today the centers of population are concentrated here. Vast inner frontiers lie remote and untouched, separated from each other by great rivers, mountains, forests, and deserts. Simon Bolivar saw these natural barriers as major obstacles to trade and communication and to his dream of a single great Latin American republic.

Because of them, Latin American countries for a century and a half tended to look outward for their markets to Europe and the United States.

Now they are looking inward as well. They see the same barriers, but they see them as less formidable. They are confident that with modern technology they can be overcome. Now with projects set in motion by the Alliance for Progress, men are beginning to carve roads along the slopes of the Andes, push bridges across the rushing rivers, connect power grids, extend pipelines, and link the overland national markets.

The barriers of nature symbolize

obstructions every bit as restrictive as the artificial trade barriers than men erect. The work to remove them both must proceed together.

Latin American leaders have seen the very real threat of industrial stagnation in the high tariff barriers they have erected against their commerce with each other. They see economic integration as indispensable to their future industrial growth.

The Central American countries, stimulated by Alliance programs, have already achieved spectacular increases in trade and investment. The larger grouping of South American states and Mexico, however, has approached economic unity at a slower pace.

Now both groups together must systematically move toward a Latin American Common Market. When this is carried into effect, it will bring the most profound change in hemispheric relations since independence. The countries of Latin America have given clear and sure indication that they intend to join together to advance toward this goal.

2. IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION

The burden of illiteracy, which the masses of people in Latin America have borne for centuries, is beginning to lift. In other times, the pace might have been satisfactory. It cannot be considered so today.

The countries of Latin America hope and aim to be economically strong. Such nations will require trained people in an abundance far greater than their classrooms and laboratories provide. The scientists, the teachers, the skilled laborers, the administrators, and the planners on whom tomorrow depends must be trained before tomorrow arrives. Children must go to school in ever-increasing numbers. Adults who have never written their names must be raised to the level of literacy. University facilities must be expanded and scientific, technical, and vocational training must be provided of different kinds and in different fields.

All of this means more schools and an expansion of educational opportunities to reach more and more people with every passing month.

3. AGRICULTURE

Half the people of Latin America live in rural areas.

Most of that rural life is still shackled by poverty and neglect. Agricultural productivity is still restricted by out-dated methods and outmoded policies. Comprehensive programs and reforms must be accelerated to bring modern farming techniques to the campo.

We and our neighbors to the south envision a dynamic Latin American agriculture which will help raise the standards of rural life.

We envision a sufficient increase in the production of food to provide for their growing populations—and to help meet world needs as well.

We envision a modernization of farming policies and techniques which will lead to a healthy competitive climate for food production.

4. HEALTH

Finally, we will strive harder than ever before to improve the health of all the people.

The battle against diseases that kill and cripple will be intensified.

Programs to make safe water supply and essential sanitation services available to all will be accelerated.

Nutrition levels for poor children and their parents will be advanced.

These are the problems we face together, and the promises we envision together, as we prepare for Punta del Este.

The problems are real. But the promises are also real. They are not empty visions. They are all within our reach. They will not be accomplished quickly or easily. But they are objectives worthy of the support of all our people.

INCREASED ASSISTANCE

In keeping with the spirit of our commitment under the Alliance for Progress and after a careful review of the objectives which our Latin American neighbors have set for themselves, I believe that we should pledge increased financial assistance in the years ahead.

The fundamental principle which has guided us in the past—demonstrated need and self-help—will continue to shape our actions in the future.

I recommend that Congress approve a commitment to increase our aid by up to \$1.5 billion or about \$300 million per year over the next 5 years.

It must not be at the expense of our efforts in other parts of this troubled world.

This amount will be in addition to the \$1 billion we have been annually investing in the future of Latin American democracy, since the Alliance for Progress began 6 years ago. The total value of our economic assistance, even after the proposed increases, will still be only a fraction of the resources the Latin American nations are themselves investing.

The \$1.5 billion increase I propose must be considered an approximate figure. Its precise determination will depend on steps which the Latin American nations themselves must take. But even so, we can project in a general way what will be necessary:

1. AGRICULTURE, EDUCATION, AND HEALTH

Approximately \$900 million of this increase should be used over the next 5 years to train teachers and build new laboratories and classrooms; to increase food production and combat the malnutrition which stunts the promise of young children; to fight disease and cure the ill.

One hundred million dollars of this amount has been included in the fiscal 1968 budget totals. I will request that it be added to the new obligatory authority of \$543 million already recommended for the Alliance for Progress.

For the next 4 fiscal years, the additional annual amount of some \$200 million is within the \$750 million authorization for the Alliance for Progress approved by Congress last year.

2. LATIN AMERICAN COMMON MARKET

Approximately one-quarter to one-half billion dollars over a 3- to 5-year period, beginning about 1970, may be required to assist Latin America to move toward a common market.

Progress in this direction will require a period of transition. To help with this adjustment, assistance can be used to retrain workers, ease balance-of-payments problems, and stimulate intra-Latin American trade.

The members of the Alliance for Progress, including the United States, should be prepared to finance this assistance on an equitable matching basis.

I will ask Congress to authorize these funds only when the first essential steps toward a common market are taken.

3. MULTINATIONAL PROJECTS—COMMUNICATIONS, ROADS AND SYSTEMS

Approximately \$150 million over a 3-year period should provide additional funds to the Inter-American Bank's Fund for Special Operations. These increased contributions can help finance preinvestment studies and a portion of the cost of new multinational projects:

Roads to link the nations and people of Latin America.

Modern communication networks to speed communications.

Bridges to carry the fruits of commerce over river barriers; dams to stem the ravages of flood.

Hydroelectric plants to provide a plentiful source of power for growth and prosperity.

We will request congressional authorization to provide this amount together with our regular \$250 million annual contribution for each of the next 3 years to the Inter-American Bank's Fund for Special Operations.

We expect our partners in the Bank to increase their contributions on a proportional basis.

CONCLUSION

For the nations participating, Punta del Este will be a returning. It was there, 6 years ago in that city by the sea, that the American nations framed the charter of the Alliance which unites the hopes of this hemisphere.

We will be bringing with us the accumulated wisdom shaped by the experience gained in the years that have intervened.

We have learned much. Our sister countries know, and know well, that the burden of the task is theirs, the decisions are theirs, the initiative to build these new societies must be theirs. They know that the only road to progress is the road of self-help.

They know that our role can only be that of support, with our investment only a small portion of what they themselves contribute to their future.

This knowledge strengthens their own resolve, and their own commitment.

The people of the United States have learned, over the 6 years since that first conference at Punta del Este, that the investment to which we pledged our support there is a good and honorable one.

It is an investment made in the spirit of our world view, so well described by a great American jurist, Learned Hand:

Right knows no boundaries, and justice no frontiers; the brotherhood of man is not a domestic institution.

That view of the world provides us with the knowledge that service is mutually rewarding. We have learned in the span of a generation that when we help others in a truly meaningful way, we serve our own vital interests as well.

I could go to the summit meeting with the President's Exchange authority and reach understandings with our Latin American neighbors on behalf of this country. I believe it is much more in our democratic tradition if the Executive and the Congress work together as partners in this matter.

I am, therefore, going to you in the Congress not after a commitment has been made, but before making any commitment. I seek your guidance and your counsel. I have already met with some 40 of your leaders.

I am asking the entire Congress and the American people to consider thoroughly my recommendations. I will look to their judgment and support as I prepare for our Nation's return to Punta del Este.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 13, 1967.

ALL ASPECTS OF THE ALLIANCE REMAIN VALID

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as President Johnson prepares to meet with his fellow Chief Executives of the Western Hemisphere next month, it is imperative that he take with him the knowledge that the Congress and the American people are conscious of the significance of this meeting at the summit. It is remarkable that Presidents and heads of government are gathering together to set the course for social and economic development in the Americas for the next 10 or 15 years. This in itself clearly demonstrates the importance we Americans—throughout the hemisphere—give to our peaceful revolution, the Alliance for Progress.

I think it is important to stress that all of the original goals of the Alliance for Progress are being actively pursued by the United States and its Latin American partners in this historic endeavor.

It is well to remember that the specific items of consideration on the agenda for this important meeting are all listed and described in the Charter of Punta del Este, the document that was signed by the Alliance nations back in August of 1961. Common Market arrangement for Latin America and development of rural life, for example, are stated clearly in the Alliance charter as major goals. And all the other goals, to be sure, are in various stages of achievement. In most countries, for example, major tax modernization steps have already been taken, and programs of agricultural reform are

already in being. Efforts to meet the staggering demand for decent housing, and similar social goals of the Alliance, not only continue but continue in most countries at an increasingly faster pace.

In short, what the six-point agenda of the summit amounts to is really an emphasis of certain priorities. The members of the Alliance have recognized, in other words, that certain goals of the Alliance in this sixth year require special attention. At this point, we jointly have recognized the importance of emphasizing these six key areas in this broad development endeavor.

The goals described in 1961, in the Charter of Punta del Este, remain our goals today. And I believe that action to come from the summit meeting at Punta del Este, 1967, will carry us more quickly toward realization of those goals.

Let us make it clear, then, that we fully understand President Johnson's mission and that we support his efforts enthusiastically.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, who I believe will be a member of the subcommittee that considers this important matter.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding, and I concur with his remarks.

It is clear from the President's message on the Latin American summit meeting, and from the evidence of prospering neighbors, that the Alliance for Progress has produced concrete results and not just rhetoric during the last 6 years of its existence.

Surely such results have been possible largely because of the commitment and dedication of the Latin American countries themselves to the principles of Punta del Este.

Self-help was a guiding concept of the Alliance. And the President's message illustrates how it has now become the keystone of its growing success.

The ideas which the heads of state of the hemisphere will discuss next month—particularly those of a Latin American Common Market and of multinational projects for transportation and communication—are proof of the encouraging initiative that has been generated by our Latin American neighbors themselves. The President's message makes clear the need for that initiative to survive and prosper. But it recognizes too the role that we must play to perpetuate both the Alliance and the bold hemispheric incentives that its programs have inspired.

I feel certain that my colleagues will agree that the forthcoming meeting at Punta del Este presents a unique opportunity to maximize the impact of U.S. cooperation on the promising progress of this hemisphere.

Mr. ALBERT. May I say to the gentleman, I appreciate his strong endorsement. It is most important that his subcommittee act expeditiously and that we pass this legislation before Easter.

Mr. FASCELL. I am sure the Committee on Foreign Affairs will act expeditiously.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on Latin America gives renewed hope for the success of the summit meeting in Punta del Este that will be held in a few weeks. I warmly endorse this message as a clear indication of our Nation's willingness to be full and active partners in the affairs of this hemisphere in the months and years ahead.

The problems of Latin America are centuries old. They demand a coordinated attack by daring and ingenious men, with a commitment of human and material resources adequate to meet the needs of 200 million people.

As our President meets with other heads of State in Uruguay, he can be assured of the enthusiastic support of the American people, who want to be both good neighbors and helping partners for hemispheric progress.

I think that President Johnson can also count on the support of the 90th Congress. I believe that the overwhelming majority of the Members will endorse his request to increase our Latin American aid by about \$300 million per year over the next 5 years.

This increase reflects the hard realities and growing needs for achieving fundamental progress in health, nutrition, and education—basics for the kind of political and social stability so necessary to economic progress.

The Alliance for Progress is now 6 years old. The total value of our economic assistance, even after the proposed increases, will still be only a fraction of the resources the Latin American nations are themselves investing.

We in Congress can do nothing less than to fully support the President's request and reaffirm America's commitment to a strong and stable Latin America.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in support of our President's dynamic leadership in proposing for the seventies "a decade of singular Latin American achievement." This is truly, as he said, a "critically important new phase of the Alliance for Progress," and I would like to add the supposition that by the time the seventies have melded into the eighties, Americans both North and South will look back on these days—and especially on April 1967 and the President's meeting at Punta del Este—as the turning point in a bold new design for the future.

For free trade awaits us on the horizon. It is only for us to march off in search of it, and this we will be beginning to do today, behind the steps of our leader, President Johnson. The best hope for a major breakthrough in the economic development of our good neighbors to the south—and they need a major breakthrough, we all know that—is rapid progress toward economic integration. Up to now, some progress has been made toward that goal: the Latin American Free Trade Association and, even more, the Central American Common Market. Progress has not been fast enough, but still these organizations have helped to show us the way. In Central America, for example, exports between the five

member countries grew from \$33 million in 1960 to \$140 million in 1965. In the larger LAFTA, which now includes Mexico and nine South American countries, progress toward cutting down restrictions to trade has been a bit slower though there have been signs of movement. Exports have risen from \$775 million in 1962 to \$1.4 billion in 1965, almost double.

This, however, is not enough. If the countries of Latin America are to progress ahead of their 2.9-percent annual growth rate in population, they must do better. Its population of 200 million today may very likely be 600 million by the turn of the century. Time is not on our side; we must act, and we must act together.

Like the doubling of exports in the LAFTA, the countries of Latin America also doubled their gross national income between 1950 and 1965, lifting it from \$35.2 billion to \$70.7 billion. This is good, but it is not enough. During the same period, the United States increased its GNP by 300 percent—from \$284.6 billion to more than \$700 billion. Clearly, we here in the United States are pulling away from our friends to the south, and this is not right. Here we enjoy a per capita GNP of \$3,270. Compare that with the Latin American's \$325.

Indeed, there must be a significant increase in the rate of economic growth. I would add that just an increase is not enough; it must be significant, and it must be impressive.

It can be achieved, but we must all work together. The decade ahead calls for ever closer cooperation between all of us in this hemisphere. I mean not merely at the government level, important as that is, but also through cultural, business, intellectual, educational, and recreational associations. We must see each other more, and we must meet with each other more.

Almost 6 years ago, the Charter of Punta del Este set in motion a vast new dream of building a stronger Latin America that will take its place in the great new future that lies before us. President Johnson is both recommitting this country to that pledge and laying out new and stronger guidelines. He and his fellow chief executives seek to harness the vast transformations that are taking place in this hemisphere, harness them for the good of all.

My colleagues recall the high tariffs and restrictive trade policies which characterized our country during the 1920's and the early 1930's. Then, under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, amended and expanded on various occasions through 1962, we set the course of trade policy, harnessing the trends evident in other of world's great trading nations, toward liberalization and trade expansion. At first, American business was cautious and skeptical, but they need not have been. The benefits of this policy to American business are now part of history. Our exports have increased 13 times over. In the early 1930's, we sold about \$2 billion of our commodities abroad; by 1948 the figure had jumped to \$12.5 billion and last year was over \$27 billion.

We shall all benefit, North and South, from a liberalized trade policy in the Americas. As the President said last summer:

We are ready . . . to work in close cooperation toward an integrated Latin America. To my fellow Presidents I pledge: Move boldly along this path and the United States will be at your side.

Let us march forward boldly together. Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, self-criticism has always been one of the strong points of the American culture. Whenever we do not have anything else to do, we always look around to see what we can complain about.

For years, our Latin American policies have been a prime target for such self-criticism. And we always seem to have plenty of experts who can tell us exactly what we are doing wrong, and why. We are constantly being reminded of one abysmal failure after another.

Now, it is not my purpose today to defend every action we have taken—or have failed to take—in Latin America. Surely we have made mistakes. Surely we could have done more. Surely we could have anticipated problems.

But let us not blind ourselves to what we have done right. Let us learn from our errors, to be sure. But let us also learn from our successes.

Today, President Johnson has sent us a major document on Latin America. And he has given us just such a reasoned and balanced progress report. I commend it to the attention of every American. If its urgency cries out for their concern, its list of accomplishments cries out for their applause.

The fact is, we have made progress in Latin America. And if it is difficult to perceive, it is only because so much more remains to be done.

Someone once noted that "history never records the alternatives." This is what President Johnson is telling us in his message today. He says:

Statistics can never tell us what might have been. They cannot record the shots which might have rung out in the avenues and plazas of a dozen Latin American cities, but did not—or the howls of angry crowds which might have formed, but did not. Yet the full success of the Alliance for Progress to this point must be sought not only in what has been accomplished but what has been avoided as well.

I hope we will all remember this as we consider the President's proposals to us today. Some will say we are piling failure on top of failure. But I say we are building on a record of compassion and accomplishment—and I hope we will continue to do so.

Let us support the President's program, so that we may never know what failure is really like.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the American people are well known for their dedication to the concept of the good neighbor. The President's timely message crystallizes the broader implications of that concept as we prepare to meet with our Nation's neighbors to the south.

Mr. Johnson's appeal is thorough in its evaluation of past accomplishment under the Alliance for Progress. It is

farsighted in its examination and interpretation of the tasks we face. The progress of our hemisphere is indivisible. If it is strengthened in one of our sister republics it stands strengthened on our own soil.

The President is rightly heartened by the encouraging signs of sturdy leadership, initiative, and self-help among our Latin neighbors. His message is not a blind commitment to short-term objectives. It is, rather, an enlightened invitation to a unique opportunity which the United States will have in April at Punta del Este to fortify the growing incentive of our neighbors to help themselves.

He welcomes the moves that Latin America has made toward the integration of its economic resources. But he recognizes that economic development is impossible without concurrent improvement in the social conditions and in the existing institutions of Latin America. In this area, we can do much to help advance the progress that has already been made through existing multinational projects.

The President's proposals provide an intelligent and resourceful blueprint for action in the "period of transition" which such a revolutionary concept as economic integration entails. They reflect the highest traditions of the spirit of our commitment under the Alliance as well as a careful review of the objectives which our Latin neighbors have set for themselves.

The total value of the assistance recommended in the President's message is insignificant when compared with the dividends it now promises to yield. Furthermore, in the President's own words, it is but a fraction of what the Latin American nations are themselves investing.

I feel confident that my fellow colleagues will promptly enact Mr. Johnson's sound and salutary program.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the President's strong message on the Latin American summit meeting calls on our wisdom and vision as we look to our neighbors to the south. We might find this hemisphere in less promising political and economic circumstances today were it not for the early success of the Alliance for Progress. In the 6 years of its life, the Alliance has given us proof that the rising expectations of the peoples of the Americas can, in fact, be met through the peaceful revolution that was ignited at Punta del Este in 1961.

The President has listed the inspiring change which the Alliance has brought to the people for whose lives it is directed. The present picture of Communist Cuba where terror sought to redress ancient wrongs offers a naked contrast to the promising vistas of the true revolution of the Alliance to better men's lives in peace.

Given its performance to date, an acceleration of the Alliance now appears to be a realistic goal. An added U.S. investment in the future of our hemisphere now guarantees an abundant return.

The major share of the burden, as the President has stated, will be borne by our Latin American neighbors. But we

can assist expediency in the areas of highest priority for economic and social development.

We can help streamline educational and agricultural programs directly related to the vital human resources of our sister republics. We can facilitate their realization of a Common Market and accelerate its promise for their industrial growth.

We can assist in the task of building the necessary substructure of highways and communications links so vital to the advancement of their goals.

Our technical assistance in many vital areas, including housing and banking, has been welcomed and utilized. The Inter-American Development Bank is filling a real need.

The President's message is a clear call to continue in a task that affects us all—as neighbors in a hemisphere and as partners in its peaceful development.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the message by President Johnson on the Latin American summit meeting will rank among the great and historic state papers on a hemispheric solidarity that long has been the dream of the wisest of the statesmen of this hemisphere and the goal of their united and dedicated efforts.

President Johnson tells us that he looks to this meeting with enthusiasm and describes the peaceful and progressive revolution which is transforming Latin America as one of the great inspirational movements of our times. Never has the President approached any problem or presented any program with more enthusiasm and with more persuasive power. This was true in the conference in the Cabinet room at the White House on Saturday, which I, as a ranking member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, was privileged and honored to attend, and it is reflected in today's message to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I can vision the reading of President Johnson's dynamic message of today by the school boys and girls of all the nations of this hemisphere in generations still to be born. It voices the challenge of many years from the escape of an entire hemisphere from the bondage of poverty, disease, and ignorance and furnishes the guidelines by which dreams can be brought into realities. The President points with forceful argument to the prospect of a population of 1 billion in this hemisphere by the year 2000, some 625 living in Latin America, and what a hemisphere of abundance and of happy welfare it may be if in the intervening years there have been established a common market and the welding together of the economies and the interests of an entire hemisphere by joint effort of the American republics. President Johnson gives fitting recognition to what he terms the emergence of a vigorous, competent, and confident new generation of Latin American leaders. May we work with them together for the attainment of the heights ahead.

The program outlined by the President will cost money, which will be money well invested and will return many fold, but the President prudently does not wish to make commitments unless and

until he has, as he expressed it, the guidance and counsel of the Congress.

I am happy to say that the 40 Members of the Congress who met with the President on Saturday, a bipartisan group from the House and the other body, expressed Hill approval of the President's dynamic program. Tomorrow the Committee on Foreign Affairs will begin its hearing on H.J. Res. 428, introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, on which I have served for nearly 12 years. I anticipate early approval of the resolution by the committee and its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, for many years, beginning long before World War II, when I was a nightly commentator over WCFL in Chicago, I have advocated a foreign and an economic policy that gives priority to Latin America and to Africa as the areas of the world closest to our national interest in trade, culture, and security. The shortest crossing of the Atlantic is from Africa to South America. In Latin America and in Africa are the great potential markets of our product. And if we keep the cold war and the hot war out of Africa and Latin America, which to a large extent we have succeeded in doing, we have made an abiding contribution to the cause of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat the President's message of today will rank among the great and historic state papers in the story of a hemisphere that pulled itself from the imprisonment of poverty, disease, and ignorance by sheer will, by co-operatively working together, by self-help and by abiding faith in one another.

Mr. President, you lead into the new day of hemispheric solidarity. With faith in you and in the goal we seek, we will follow.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the joint congressional resolution regarding the forthcoming Inter-American Chiefs of State meeting of Punta del Este, Uruguay. The agenda proposals for that meeting, which I have studied closely, promise a significant further acceleration of economic and social development in Latin America and a major new impulse in inter-American cooperation.

I am particularly gratified by the emphasis placed on economic integration. It is apparent to me that our good friends to the south are prepared to make a truly determined effort toward a common market over the next decade. While the complexity and difficulty of the integration task should not be underestimated, the potential benefits for the development of Latin America are profound—as the European experience testifies. Initiatives in this area require and deserve the understanding and support of this Congress.

It should be noted that the goal of economic integration in Latin America has already been commended by a number of private organizations and individuals. Of particular significance, and perhaps of interest to my colleagues, is a resolution on Latin American Regional Economic Integration adopted by the 53d National Foreign Trade Convention last

November. As you may be aware, the convention has been sponsored and conducted since 1914 by the National Foreign Trade Council, a private, nonpolitical business organization devoted to the promotion and protection of United States foreign trade and investments. The convention brings together executives of U.S. business organizations for examination of important issues in our foreign economic policy.

In its resolution on economic integration the convention urges that:

The U.S. business community and officials of the Government intensify our cooperation with the Latin American Free Trade Area and the Central American Common Market, and with their member countries, to encourage and foster accomplishment of their objectives. This cooperation should be directed especially toward the creation of an active common market, to the benefit of the ultimate consumer.

I wish to be identified with this attitude of firm support for Latin American integration. The full text of the resolution by the 53d Foreign Trade Convention is as follows:

RESOLUTION ON LATIN AMERICAN REGIONAL ECONOMIC INTEGRATION

Both programs of regional economic integration in Latin America—the Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA) and the Central American Common Market (CACM)—offer real promise for achieving the desired increase in the rate of economic growth and marked elevation of standards of living. Despite some accomplishments, there is much work yet to be done.

The Convention commends the progress which has been made and the efforts of self-help being put forth by the countries of the hemisphere to move more rapidly toward these vital goals. The investment in development by Latin American countries is impressive and encouraging. The benefits to be derived from greater movements of goods, capital, ideas and people, will be fostered and accelerated to the extent that the governments increasingly encourage the full cooperation and participation of private enterprise.

To promote regional communications which are essential to economic integration, continued emphasis should be given in allocating funds provided by the United States Government to fostering regional programs such as highways and telecommunications.

The Convention urges that the United States business community and officials of the Government intensify our cooperation with LAFTA and CACM, and with their member countries, to encourage and foster accomplishment of their objectives. This cooperation should be directed especially toward the creation of an active common market, to the benefit of the ultimate consumer; the program of industrial complementarity; and the working out of a sound policy with respect to constructive participation of private enterprise of whatever source in the achievement of these goals.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in support of the joint resolution on the forthcoming summit meeting as I consider congressional adoption of this resolution essential to the success of the meeting of the Chiefs of State of our hemisphere in charting the course of our Alliance for Progress throughout the decade of the seventies.

For our adoption of this resolution will demonstrate to our friends in Latin America that the people of the United States—through their representatives in

the Congress—stand firmly and fully behind President Johnson's effort to move ahead with all possible speed toward the creation of a Latin American Common Market, and that we intend to contribute our full share toward insuring self-sustaining growth—in which private initiative and private enterprise shall play an increasing role—throughout the hemisphere.

One of the most important results of greater regional cooperation in Latin America would be the growing attraction it would exert upon hitherto untapped private capital for development purposes—and the encouragement it would give to the growth of local capital markets within Latin America.

Under the Alliance for Progress, the United States has done much to increase the role of private investment—both within and outside Latin America—in encouraging economic growth in Latin America.

As of June 30, 1966, AID and predecessor agencies had authorized dollar loans of roughly \$422 million to 61 intermediate credit institutions and cooperatives in 19 Latin American countries. In addition to these dollar loans, the Agency has contributed well over \$200 million—in equivalent value—of local currency to intermediate credit institutions in eight Latin American countries.

The impact of these loans to industrial development banks, housing institutions, agricultural credit banks, and to cooperatives has been considerable. In many instances the loans were instrumental in establishing the first such intermediate credit institution in the country involved. Practically all of these loans have been accompanied by additional private and public investment in the credit institutions and in this respect the impact of the AID loans in terms of new funds available to local borrowers exceeds the roughly \$622 million which has been committed to date. Furthermore, each subloan from a development bank or savings and loan association is further matched with a contribution by the local investors or homeowners.

AID has also furnished considerable technical assistance to the private sector in Latin America—assistance ranging from the provision of a part-time adviser to a particular local institution to more extensive, AID-sponsored assistance from U.S. consulting firms, universities, cooperative and private institutions. And other AID programs have helped stimulate the flow of U.S. private investment to Latin America.

The new course that President Johnson has proposed for the Alliance—and to which we would pledge our support by the passage of the resolution before us—would accelerate this trend already well underway toward greater private participation in furthering economic progress in Latin America. It would go a long way toward enabling the economies of Latin America to stand on their own feet—and toward financing their growth through the more normal channels of private trade and private investment, rather than from the continued infusion of outside public funds.

We can have no illusions that this transformation will occur overnight.

But it is underway. And we can spur it on by adopting this resolution.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, next month, the President will attend a summit meeting with the chiefs of state of Latin America to assess the Alliance for Progress and to determine what steps are necessary to quicken the pace of progress.

I have noted with great interest the increasing tempo of the Alliance. What is especially gratifying is that more and more of the Latins are accepting their own heavy responsibilities in connection with the development of their nations.

This self-help is the key. We in the United States cannot cure the problems of Latin America. Only the Latins' own strenuous efforts can accomplish the necessary goals of economic, social, and political progress.

To these efforts, we contribute the vital catalysts of technical assistance and capital. I am proud of this contribution. It represents a realization of our responsibilities to our neighbors. It indicates that we have asked ourselves and answered correctly the following questions:

What right do we have to assert leadership in the world—unless we can prove our willingness and ability to help our neighbors in their struggle for economic, social, and political progress?

What right do we have to suggest to our African and Asian friends that representative democracy, responsive to the needs of its people, is the way of the future—if we fail to assist this hemisphere to achieve these goals?

We may be proud of our contribution to the Alliance for Progress. Castro is no longer a substantial figure of leadership in Latin America. The past 5 years have seen much progress. Juan Valdez, the John Smith of Latin America, may be living a better life. But what is more important is that his eyes have been opened to a realization of what great things can lie ahead for him and his children. These aroused expectations must be realized. Señor Valdez is not going to sink back into the morass of futility. Juan's leaders throughout Latin America are increasingly aware of this, and more and more are struggling to help Juan with his problems.

But these leaders and their governments need help, and we must provide that help if we make any claim to a sense of humanity and leadership.

It is in response to this expressed need that the President has agreed to join the chiefs of states of Latin America next month.

The agenda of the meeting speaks in terms of economic integration, multinational projects, and so forth. But as high-level deliberations take place on these themes, let us bear in mind that these are only the tools to accomplish the purpose—the purpose of helping our neighbor, Juan Valdez.

I say to our President that the John Smiths of this country wish him God-speed.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, revolutionary changes are taking place today in our hemisphere. Once unlettered and deprived peoples are clamoring for and attaining their rightful place in the modern world of the 20th century.

To a great extent these new developments and the fresh hope of fulfillment which accompanies them have arisen as a direct result of U.S. financial and technical assistance under the Alliance for Progress.

On April 12, President Johnson will meet with his fellow American chief executives in a summit meeting at an already historic site—Punta del Este, Uruguay. There, where the Alliance was born in August 1961, our President will reiterate this country's support for the legitimate claims to the basic needs of millions, for homes, work and land, health and schools.

The vast hemispheric economic and social development program which began with such high hopes at the beginning of this decade will receive new impulse, and will shift from its initial organizational phase into a much broader program of economic integration and multilateral endeavor.

The Alliance for Progress has achieved major breakthrough in the social and economic fields. Millions of our fellow Americans in Latin America are now free of the scourge of malaria and similar endemic threats; thousands of new classrooms provide adequate space and equipment for eager students; countless farmers are reaping better crop yields through technical and financial assistance under supervised agricultural credit programs; small industries are being established through U.S.-provided seed capital to help diversify traditional one-crop economies; tens of thousands of people are dwelling in new homes—all these and many more achievements can be traced to programs under the Alliance for Progress.

Although the most difficult part of our task lies ahead, we can, nevertheless, be proud of these accomplishments. What would our hemisphere be like today if we never had an Alliance for Progress?

We can also be satisfied as a nation that we have not shirked our Alliance commitments. The 10-year, \$100 billion program established in 1961 called for 80 percent of the financing to come from public and private sources in Latin America itself. Of the remaining 20 percent, 10 percent represented the U.S. commitment and the rest was to come from international lending bodies.

In the first 5 years of the program the United States more than met its pledge of \$1 billion per year through contributions via AID, Export-Import Bank, Food for Peace, the Social Progress Trust Fund—administered by the Inter-American Development Bank—the Peace Corps and others.

Efforts and results have proved satisfying, but above all the one single, underlying achievement which dwarfs all others in significance is the new, pervading Alliance spirit which can be seen and felt throughout Latin America. As President Johnson said in his speech commemorating the fifth anniversary of the Alliance last August:

The Republics of this hemisphere have shown that deep social change is compatible with peace, is consistent with democracy, and is consonant with individual liberty. We have sounded a sure and certain note; namely, that great change can be wrought

by reason and not rifles, by builders and not bullets.

Above all, there is a new trend toward self-reliance of the type that generates self-pride and the strength to accomplish self-imposed change.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once wrote:

Welcome evermore to gods and men is the self-helping man.

If this famous essayist were alive today he would be overjoyed to witness the application of this principle of self-help throughout Latin America. This concept has from the very start been the key to the success of our hemispheric development programs, for without it no amount of foreign aid can help.

President Johnson has repeatedly indicated our country's willingness to help those nations who help themselves.

U.S. assistance has aided innumerable self-help projects in Latin America—whether in national programs such as tax and agrarian reform or on the grassroots level in community development projects.

I should like to mention just a few such programs today.

You may be interested to know that each AID mission director in Latin America now draws from a special fund of \$50,000 to support small, high-impact activities. In these projects dividends have been far in excess of the amount of U.S. assistance invested. For example, in Costa Rica 195 hand pumps were made available to rural communities that lacked potable water. In Bolivia \$250 worth of cement enabled a community to finish building a wing on a children's hospital.

Often entire villages derive their livelihood from the production of one or more handicraft items. AID and the Peace Corps are actively supporting programs to help such communities maintain their income through improved and expanded production.

In Ecuador AID and the Peace Corps are lending assistance to "town plans" aimed at comprehensive community improvement. In Cayambe, local citizens, under the town physician, have cooperated in the construction of a modern marketplace, a health clinic, a carpentry co-op, and in providing up-to-date equipment for their schools.

In one small town overlooking 2-mile-high Lake Titicaca in Bolivia, a young American Peace Corpsman is working side by side with his Bolivian partner, building and installing water pumps.

Food for peace provides part payment in foods to workers building small farm-to-market roads.

These and many more community development projects are giving new meaning to the lives of millions of inhabitants of small rural towns in Latin America.

As the American Presidents gather in Punta del Este, they will consider new, more effective means of achieving the goals of the Alliance. May our moral support and best wishes for a fruitful outcome accompany our Nation's leader and his assistants as they represent our country at this historic inter-American meeting.

Thank you.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I want

to commend President Johnson on his special message to Congress regarding the Latin American summit meeting. It is reassuring and encouraging that despite the many demands on his time, the President is clearly not ignoring our responsibilities to our neighbors to the south. His vigorous support for the Alliance for Progress once again testifies to our recognition of the urgency involved in helping these neighbors to help themselves.

In the 5½ years since the first historic meeting at Punta del Este, the cooperative efforts of the American Governments and peoples have resulted in substantial progress. But even as we have progressed we have recognized that, in order to achieve the Alliance's goals of opportunity and stability, the pace of progress must be stepped up significantly. Otherwise, we shall repeat the mistakes of the past characterized so aptly by the phrase, "too little, too late."

In his quest for continued and accelerated progress, President Johnson is planning to journey in April to a second historic conference at Punta del Este. There, with the Presidents of the other American Republics, he will join in a rededication to the goals of the Alliance, and a new commitment to concrete measures for achieving those goals.

Not the least of the Alliance's goals is to alleviate the squalor, hunger and disease, the hopelessness of unemployment, and the lack of opportunity among the millions of urban poor in Latin America.

Unmanageable population increases are a fact of life throughout the underdeveloped world. Latin America is the fastest growing of all these regions. Recent estimates have placed the population of Latin America at 200 million, with projected totals of 300 million by 1975 and more than 600 million by the year 2000—tripling the present number in 35 years.

However, the most striking feature of Latin American population growth is the rapid movement to the cities. The rate of urbanization in Latin America is the highest of any underdeveloped region in the world. Growth rates of 4 to 5 percent have brought the total urban population to where it now exceeds the rural by several hundred thousand. With continuing high rates of natural increase and heavy farm-to-city migration, this slight margin is expected to grow to more than 15 million by the end of the decade.

Twenty-five percent of the population is concentrated in 10 metropolitan areas of over 1 million each. The stagnation of rural economies and the attraction of the urban areas send thousands more to the great Latin American cities every day. More than 60 percent of the people of Argentina, Chile, and Venezuela live in cities. The urban populations of Colombia, Mexico, and Uruguay are rapidly approaching the 50 percent mark.

This trend toward urbanization is a characteristic of all developing societies. It is generally recognized as a basic index of economic growth. But the accelerated rate prevailing in Latin America, under conditions of unplanned growth, confronts urban centers with a wide range of critical problems. Central to all is their lack of capacity to provide

jobs, housing, water, sanitation, education, and medical care. If the social and economic problems of Latin America are to be dealt with realistically, the needs of the cities must receive urgent consideration.

When the summit conference at Punta del Este is called to order, the agenda before the American Presidents will not carry the topic "Urban Problems" as such. But every item on the agenda will have as its primary or secondary purpose alleviation of those critical problems associated with accelerated urbanization.

One major item addresses itself directly to educational development and intensification of health programs, as well as to technological and scientific development. In the item aimed at modernization of rural life and increase of agricultural productivity, principally of food, it is not difficult to foresee the benefit to the hungry urban poor.

Three major items are addressed directly to acceleration of economic activity throughout Latin America. They deal with the Latin American economic integration and industrial development, multinational action for infrastructure projects, and measures to improve international trade conditions. In the terms of reference of Latin America's urbanized millions, those items translate first into jobs, and then into better housing, better clothing and better food; into utilities and urban services; into schools and hospitals, teachers and doctors; into greater satisfaction of needs and wants; into respect and care for human dignity; into economic mobility, and broadened horizons and rising hopes.

Even the final item on the agenda, elimination of military expenditures excepting what is absolutely essential, aims at drawing the string from a curse which has haunted many nations: the priority of guns before butter, of shiny implements of war amid the shadows of poverty, sickness, and despair.

These are purposes to which all of us can dedicate ourselves. We have before us the means to express that dedication immediately, in the resolution of moral and financial support for the commitments the President will be called upon to make at the summit.

To speed the Western Hemisphere along the way it chose at Punta del Este more than 5 years ago, I urge that we give the President and this resolution our strongest endorsement.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE TODAY

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Education and Labor be permitted to convene for the purpose of hearing witnesses this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SELDEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). This is District of Columbia day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that each of these bills to be called up today was passed last year by the House, but the Senate did not have time to take action on them before adjournment.

INCORPORATION OF MERCHANT MARINE WAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House District Committee, I call up H.R. 1944 for the incorporation of the Merchant Marine War Veterans Association.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1944

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following-named persons, to wit:

Raymond Jacobs, Chicago, Illinois;
Tom Truxtun McWade, Chicago, Illinois;
John Scotello, Chicago, Illinois;
E. A. Garrett, Chicago, Illinois;
F. L. Staszewski, Chicago, Illinois;
Frank L. Morgan, Bensenville, Illinois;
Ira E. Bishop, Homewood, Illinois;
Robert Kaforski, Chicago, Illinois;
Thomas V. Murphy, Chicago, Illinois;
James W. MacKenzie, Chicago, Illinois;
Stanley T. Deering, Chicago, Illinois;
Robert H. Salvesen, Franklin Park, Illinois;
Charles W. Wilson, Chicago, Illinois;
Chester L. Ratowski, Chicago, Illinois;
Obie A. Hawker, Senior, Washington, District of Columbia;
Art Payne, Chicago, Illinois;
William G. May, Chicago, Illinois;
Alfonso DeSoto, Chicago, Illinois;
Captain Daniel C. Green, Chicago, Illinois;
Robert J. Morgan, Skokie, Illinois;
Robert Broadhead, Elmhurst, Illinois;
Raymond E. Gongola, Elmwood Park, Illinois;
James Sheehan, Downers Grove, Illinois;
Willi Willis, Lake Forest, Illinois;
Terry Kenny, Chicago, Illinois;
Captain David A. Jones, Chicago, Illinois;
George Bean, Chicago, Illinois;
William Berkovitz, Chicago, Illinois;
John Dewar, Chicago, Illinois;
Frank Draper, Chicago, Illinois;
John S. Hambright, Chicago, Illinois;
Robert Kannberg, Chicago, Illinois;
George Laudermitth, Chicago, Illinois;
John C. Mead, Chicago, Illinois;
Harry A. Skinner, Chicago, Illinois;
Captain Robert Ammon, Chicago, Illinois;
Jack Billow, Chicago, Illinois;
Captain Roy Christianson, Chicago, Illinois;
William J. Curton, Chicago, Illinois;
Harry L. Siegler, Chicago, Illinois;
Captain Don K. McRae, Chicago, Illinois;
Richard Nowak, Chicago, Illinois;
Stanley M. Repel, Chicago, Illinois;
Roscoe J. Williams, Chicago, Illinois;

William Fitch, Chicago, Illinois;
Richard Christ, Chicago, Illinois;
George S. Cronk, Chicago, Illinois;
Joe Rosengard, Chicago, Illinois;
Joseph W. Zinn, Chicago, Illinois;
Louis Roskopf, Cicero, Illinois;
R. Wojcikiewicz, Chicago, Illinois;
Walter J. Hetzel, Chicago, Illinois;
Bertram W. Brown, Oak Park, Illinois;
Captain John J. Klocko, Junior, Prospect Heights, Illinois;
Louis B. Lambert, Claremont, Illinois;
Nick J. DeBrown, Franklin Park, Illinois;
Thomas F. Skahill, Elmhurst, Illinois;
William Bradley, Deerfield, Illinois;
R. B. Foryst, Olney, Illinois;
J. J. Fahrenbach, Glenview, Illinois;
Michael S. Morgan, Skokie, Illinois;
Vern Colvin, Lombard, Illinois;
Phil Provenzano, Addison, Illinois;
Sid Luckman, Highland Park, Illinois;
Reverend Arnold J. Parker, Riverdale, Illinois;
Harold Kowalski, Cicero, Illinois;
Bud Carlson, Lombard, Illinois;
Robert A. Carlsen, Berwyn, Illinois;
Steve Manookian, Melrose Park, Illinois;
Joseph M. Kerekes, Des Plaines, Illinois;
Robert E. Olson, Mount Vernon, Illinois;
E. E. Milde, Champaign, Illinois;
Ken Bruckmeyer, Worth, Illinois;
K. J. Bailey, Gurnee, Illinois;
Charles W. Wright, Chillecothe, Illinois;
Thomas A. Ross, Chicago, Illinois;
John Miaso, Chicago, Illinois;
Paul Maresky, Chicago, Illinois;
Benjamin J. Linkus, Chicago, Illinois;
Anton A. Bernacki, Chicago, Illinois;
Vincent Flack, Chicago, Illinois;
Frank A. Mendyke, Chicago, Illinois;
August J. Goyke, Chicago, Illinois;
Ray Litterski, Chicago, Illinois;
Richard L. Anderson, Baltimore, Maryland;
Kenneth F. Clausen, Fond Du Lac, Wisconsin;
Ferdinand J. Simon, Litcher, Louisiana;
Richard M. Stevenson, Groton, Connecticut;
Joe R. McAllister, Madison, South Dakota;
Paul H. Apmann, Saint Petersburg, Florida;
B. Alan Stone, Greeley, Colorado;
H. K. Martin, Muskegon, Michigan;
Richard A. Sells, Saint Louis, Missouri;
Charles J. Steichen, El Segundo, California;
Raymond L. Lottesness, Sioux Falls, South Dakota;
Martin Avignon, Junior, Laurel, Mississippi;
Clyde J. Beck, Minneapolis, Minnesota;
Arthur Chambliss, Saralan, Alabama;
Laurence N. Holden, Lincoln, Rhode Island;
Glen M. Svaren, Ashland, Oregon;
Captain John L. Beebe, New Shrewsbury, New Jersey;
Frank Harveston, Augusta, Georgia;
Robert Hotchkiss, Sedley, Virginia;
Floyd W. Reed, Pickstown, South Dakota;
Richard M. Meurer, Billings, Montana;
Warren Peterson, Indianapolis, Indiana;
Eleuterio Rosa, Bronx, New York;
Vergil Patrick, Andrews, Texas;
Gordon Westford, Spokane, Washington;
Donald C. Ahern, Brookings, South Dakota;
Robert J. Garvey, Roswell, New Mexico;
Wellington Coolidge, Saratoga, Wyoming;
David E. Fisher, Allentown, Pennsylvania;
Sterling Hayden, Nantucket, Massachusetts;
Frank A. Joslyn, Rock Rapids, Iowa;
H. S. Feay, Junior, Sioux Falls, South Dakota;
Robert E. Armstrong, Junior, Portland, Maine;
Richard R. Powers, Clarksville, Tennessee;
Joseph D. Kelly, Mansfield, Ohio;
Frank H. Throop, Marshall, Minnesota;
E. K. Verley, Sioux Falls, South Dakota;
Charles W. Bartlett, Valley City, North Dakota;
Elwin B. Benson, O'Neill, Nebraska;
Robert R. Shebal, El Cajon, California;

Lester Sampson, Sioux Falls, South Dakota;
Charles Shaw, Detroit, Michigan;
John Roscoe, Pueblo, Colorado;
Vicente R. Santos, Lake Placid, Florida;
Domenico Gallo, Danbury, Connecticut;
James Chrystal, New Orleans, Louisiana;
Eugene A. Peterson, Sioux Falls, South Dakota;
James P. Grant, Washington, District of Columbia;
Captain William W. Clendaniel, Baltimore, Maryland;
Leonard A. Cernik, Milwaukee, Wisconsin;
Ralph S. Floyd, Boston, Massachusetts;
Philip Klein, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania;
Dale Dean, Sioux Falls, South Dakota;
Roy Myers, El Paso, Texas;
Captain Clair F. Bee, Cornwall on the Hudson, New York;
Charles R. Kluge, Gary, Indiana;
Dale A. Meurer, East of Billings, Montana;
William A. McGregor, North Providence, Rhode Island;
William Meyer, Volga, South Dakota;
George Holland, New Providence, New Jersey;
Robert A. Graves, Minneapolis, Minnesota;
Elton E. Dalin, Ashtabula, Ohio;
John B. Orrand, Nashville, Tennessee;
Earl D. Muhs, Sioux Falls, South Dakota;
Thomas J. O'Connor, Los Angeles, California;
Richard Kujawa, Alpena, Michigan;
Francis J. Brady, Clearwater, Florida;
Warren A. Ferguson, Falls Village, Connecticut;
Luverne P. Jorgensen, Flandreau, South Dakota;
Clyde M. Case, Mukwonago, Wisconsin;
Captain B. Ralph Ludy, Braintree, Massachusetts;
R. J. Bish, York, Pennsylvania;
R. A. Chambers, Buffalo, New York;
Richard M. Bielski, Sioux Falls, South Dakota;
Evan O. Davis, Merrillville, Indiana;
Richard J. Augsbach, Westwood, New Jersey;
Carl A. Peters, Minneapolis, Minnesota;
James H. Kruser, Toledo, Ohio;
Leland S. Sorensen, Viborg, South Dakota;
Raymond F. Hiltgen, Torrance, California;
Robert Raehl, Muskegon, Michigan;
M. M. Boker, Fort Pierce, Florida;
Orville M. Heemstra, Milwaukee, Wisconsin;
Paul H. Parsley, Brookings, South Dakota;
Edward P. Lyons, Fall River, Massachusetts;
William Grabiak, Mount Pleasant, Pennsylvania;
Kenneth U. Marshall, Central Nyack, New York;
Edward M. Meagher, Hammond, Indiana;
Carroll D. Moeller, Naples, South Dakota;
Adrianus Van Ryn, Hoboken, New Jersey;
Florian P. Ritschel, Saint Paul, Minnesota;
Paul A. Hoiris, Parma, Ohio;
Paul Gehris, Wyomissing, Pennsylvania;
Clifford Gartmann, Wausau, Wisconsin;
Captain C. J. Van Dongen, Muskegon, Michigan;
E. V. Zafft, Sioux Falls, South Dakota;
John G. Hanks, Lakewood, California;
Paul Aaron, Arlington, South Dakota;
Everett E. Robertson, Junior, Oakland City, Indiana;
Wayne Culberston, Caledonia, New York;
Harold R. Fredrickson, Sunnyvale, California;
James Swinford, Louisville, Ohio;
D. E. Bigler, North Bergen, New Jersey;
Arvid Olson, El Cajon, California;
J. H. Muellers, Robbinsdale, Minnesota;
Robert Nelson, Fort Dix, New Jersey;
Anthony P. Velligan, Gary, Indiana;
Orval Herington, Onamia, Minnesota;
Van Heflin, Beverly Hills, California;
Worrell Klaenhammer, Saint Paul, Minnesota;

Delbert W. Houts, Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin;
Walter Skotynski, Toledo, Ohio;
H. A. Kuns, Osseo, Minnesota;
G. J. Burdick, Daly City, California;
George L. Smokovitch, Escanaba, Michigan;
Ray J. Arkell, Iona, Minnesota;
Robert W. Forsberg, Watertown, South Dakota;
Clarence Bowes, Nekoosa, Wisconsin; and
William N. Walker, Junior, Ashtabula, Ohio;

and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia, where its legal domicile shall be, by the name of the Merchant Marine War Veterans Association (hereinafter referred to as the corporation), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

It shall be the duty of the persons named in this section, jointly and severally, to file with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent a copy of this Act within fifteen days after the date of its approval.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

Sec. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this Act, acting in person or by written proxy, are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

PURPOSES OF THE CORPORATION

Sec. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be to foster appreciation for the wartime services of veterans of the American merchant marine and the United States Maritime Service, and the betterment of the plight of said veterans, through recognized methods of obtaining; the perpetuation of the Memorial Day shipboard ceremony to honor the war dead of these services, as inaugurated on Memorial Day, May 30, 1958; to encourage the retention and availability of a modernized and adequate American merchant marine held in readiness at all times; to encourage the governmental formation of a United States Maritime Service Reserve, the acknowledged training branch of the wartime American merchant marine.

CORPORATE POWERS

Sec. 4. The corporation shall have power—

- (1) to have succession by its corporate name;
- (2) to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;
- (3) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;
- (4) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as the activities of the corporation may require;
- (5) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States, the District of Columbia or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;
- (6) to contract and be contracted with;
- (7) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any public body or agency or any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual, and to hold absolutely or in trust for any of the purposes of the corporation any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of the law of any State or the District of Columbia (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the

ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State or the District of Columbia;

(8) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, encumber, and otherwise alienate real, personal, or mixed property;

(9) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal, District of Columbia, and State laws; and

(10) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP

Sec. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights, privileges, and designation of classes of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be determined as the constitution and bylaws of the corporation may provide. Eligibility for membership in the corporation shall be limited to male wartime veterans of the American merchant marine, and the United States Maritime Service, who are eligible for an honorable discharge from the United States Shipping Board recruiting service of World War I; a certificate of substantially continuous service from World War II; the equivalent discharge from the Korean conflict; and any similar type discharge from previous or subsequent conflicts.

GOVERNING AUTHORITY OF THE CORPORATION

Sec. 6. The supreme governing authority of the corporation shall be the national headquarters and national board of directors thereof, composed of such officers and elected representatives from the several States and other local subdivisions of the corporate organization as shall be provided by the constitution and bylaws: *Provided*, That the form of the government of the corporation shall always be representative of the membership at large and shall not permit the concentration of the control thereof in the hands of a limited number of members or in a self-perpetuating group not so representative. The meetings of the national headquarters may be held in any State or territory or in the District of Columbia.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS: COMPOSITION, RESPONSIBILITIES

Sec. 7. (a) Upon the enactment of this Act the membership of the initial national headquarters and the national board of directors of the corporation shall consist of the present members of the national headquarters and the national board of directors of the Merchant Marine War Veterans Association, the corporation described in section 18 of this Act, or such of them as may then be living and are qualified members of such national headquarters and national board of directors, to wit: Raymond Jacobs, Chicago, Illinois; Tom Truxtun McWade, Chicago, Illinois; John Scotello, Chicago, Illinois; E. A. Garrett, Chicago, Illinois; Frank Morgan, Bensenville, Illinois; Ira E. Bishop, Homewood, Illinois; Robert Kaforski, Chicago, Illinois; Thomas V. Murphy, Chicago, Illinois; James W. MacKenzie, Chicago, Illinois; Stanley T. Deering, Chicago, Illinois; and Francis L. Staszewski, Chicago, Illinois.

(b) Thereafter, the national headquarters and national board of directors of the corporation shall consist of such number as may be prescribed in the constitution of the corporation, and the members of such offices shall be selected in such manner (including the filling of vacancies), and shall serve for such terms, as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

(c) The national headquarters and national board of directors shall be the managing body of the corporation and shall have such powers, duties, and responsibilities as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

OFFICERS: SELECTION AND DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Sec. 8. The officers of the corporation shall be a national commander, national vice commander, national junior vice commander, national secretary, national treasurer, national master at arms, five members of the national board of directors, and such other officers as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws. The officers of the corporation shall be selected in such manner and for such terms and with such duties and titles as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE: SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

Sec. 9. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Chicago, Illinois, or in such other place as may be later determined by the national officers and national board of directors; but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the various States, the District of Columbia, and territories and possessions of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process, notice, or demand for the corporation, and service of such process, notice, or demand required or permitted by law to be served upon the corporation may be served upon such agent. The corporation shall file with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent a statement designating the initial and each successor registered agent of the corporation immediately following any such designation.

USE OF INCOME: LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, OR EMPLOYEES

Sec. 10. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, directors, or officers as such, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of compensation to officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the national officers and national board of directors of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any member of the national headquarters and national board of directors who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the payment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

Sec. 11. The corporation and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for public office.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

Sec. 12. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

Sec. 13. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS: INSPECTION

Sec. 14. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of accounts and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its national conventions, national headquarters, and national board of directors. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 15. (a) The financial transactions of the corporation shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than March 1 of each year. The report shall set forth for the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and applications of funds. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. 16. On or before March 1 of each year the corporation shall report to the Congress on its activities during the preceding fiscal year. Such report may consist of a report on the proceedings of the national convention covering such fiscal year. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

CERTAIN EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 17. The corporation and its subordinate divisions shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the name Merchant Marine War Veterans Association. The corporation shall have the exclusive and sole right to use, or allow or refuse the use of, such emblems, seals, and badges as have heretofore been used by the Illinois corporation described in section 18 and the right to which may be lawfully transferred to the corporation.

TRANSFER OF ASSETS

SEC. 18. The corporation may acquire the assets of the Merchant Marine and Maritime Service Veterans Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all the liability of such corporation and upon complying with all laws of the State of Illinois applicable thereto.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 19. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets, if any, of the corporation shall be distributed in accordance with the determination of the national headquarters and national board of directors and in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal, District of Columbia, and State laws applicable thereto.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 20. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

Mr. McMILLAN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 1944, is to provide for the incorporation of the Mer-

chant Marine War Veterans Association in the District of Columbia, where its legal domicile shall be.

The names of the incorporators, the corporate purposes, powers and procedures, membership requirements, and duties of the officers are set forth under various sections of the bill.

While the bill provides that the principal office of the corporation shall be located in Chicago, Ill., or such other place as may be determined, it is stipulated that the corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process.

The Merchant Marine & Maritime Service Veterans Association, numbering over 10,000 members in 50 States, was organized in 1957 in the State of Illinois and chartered under the "not for profit" corporation laws of that State.

Its purposes, as expressed in section 3 of the bill, are first, to foster appreciation for the wartime services of veterans of the American merchant marine and the U.S. maritime service, and the betterment of the plight of said veterans, through recognized methods of obtaining; second, the perpetuation of the Memorial Day shipboard ceremony to honor the war dead of these services, as inaugurated on Memorial Day, May 30, 1958; third, to encourage the retention and availability of a modernized and adequate American merchant marine held in readiness at all times; and (4) to encourage the governmental formation of a U.S. maritime service reserve, the acknowledged training branch of the wartime American merchant marine.

Eligibility for membership in the Merchant Marine & Maritime Service Veterans Association is limited to male wartime veterans of the American merchant marine and the U.S. maritime service who are eligible for an honorable discharge from the U.S. Shipping Board Recruiting Service of World War I, or who holds a certificate of substantially continuous service in World War II, or the equivalent discharge from the Korean conflict, or any similar type discharge from previous or subsequent conflicts.

This bill is identical to H.R. 3864 of the 89th Congress—House Report No. 731—as approved by the House on August 9, 1965.

COMMITTEE ACTION

At a public hearing August 2, 1965, on this legislation before Subcommittee No. 2 of your committee, testimony supporting the enactment of the bill was presented by Members of Congress, by the national commander of the association, and by a representative of the Corporation Counsel's office on behalf of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. No testimony was offered in opposition to the bill.

It was represented that more than 1.5 million men now living in the United States are eligible for membership in the Merchant Marine & Maritime Service Veterans Association; that the association, in line with its purposes, is dedicated to the betterment of the plight of the wartime veterans of the American merchant marine and the U.S. maritime service and to the retention and avail-

ability of a modernized and adequate American merchant marine held in readiness at all times; and that it is dedicated to the encouragement of the governmental formation of the U.S. maritime service reserve as a training branch of the wartime American merchant marine.

Enactment of this bill will not involve any additional expense to the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Commissioners advised the committee. The amendments offered were recommended by the Commissioners as the usual additions to measures of this kind.

CONCLUSION

Your committee agrees with the proponents of this legislation that the Merchant Marine War Veterans Association, as a public service organization, is deserving of charter by Congress and that the prestige of a Federal charter will assist it in informing the public of the highly important and necessary functions of the American merchant marine and U.S. maritime service.

This is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, and nonpolitical organization; it is self-supporting, its only income being membership dues; and it has been granted tax-exempt status by the Treasury Department.

The Congress on behalf of the American people owe the veterans of the maritime service a debt of gratitude which can be symbolized in the reported bill. They endured all the terrifying hazards of war at sea and helped save America from invasion. This legislation will also provide recognition of our debt to the many thousands who gave their lives in defense of this Nation.

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

TO AMEND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 829) to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to provide exemptions for certain operations of the House of Representatives from taxes imposed by that act and the District of Columbia Use Tax Act, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 829

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 128 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2605) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(s) Sales of materials and services to the printing clerks of the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives for use in the operation of such rooms, and sales of materials and services made by such clerks in connection with the operation of such rooms.

"(t) Sales of food, beverages, and other goods made to any person for use in the operation of the majority and minority cloakrooms of the House of Representatives and sales of such food, beverages, and other goods made by such person in connection with the operation of such cloakrooms."

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph (s) of section 128 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, added by the first section of this Act, shall apply with respect to the sale of materials and services made on or after January 1, 1961.

(b) Paragraph (t) of section 128 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, added by the first section of this Act, shall apply with respect to sales made on or after the first day of the first month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. McMILLAN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 829 is to exempt from the application of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act—District of Columbia Code, title 47, section 2601 and the following—and the District of Columbia Use Tax Act the operations conducted by the printing clerks of the House of Representatives in the majority and minority rooms, which were established many years ago to perform printing services for Members of the House of Representatives, and also the operations of the majority and minority cloakrooms of the House of Representatives in the purchase and sale of food, beverages, and other goods.

The printing clerks of the House of Representatives are employees of the House and receive a nominal salary in the performance of their services. The House of Representatives provides to the majority and minority rooms heat, light, space, and some furniture, but the printing clerks must supply, on their own account and expense, the printing equipment necessary to produce printed materials. Accordingly, the printing clerks must charge for their services, whether or not paper and other materials are furnished for the production of the finished printed product.

For many years the operation of the majority and minority rooms of the House was exempt from any District of Columbia taxes. The exemption was predicated upon the provisions in the District of Columbia tax law which exempt Government functions from all taxes. About 18 months ago, the tax officials of the District of Columbia learned that the equipment used by the printing clerks of the House was privately owned. Based on that finding, the District of Columbia levied property taxes retroactively against the House printing clerks and those taxes have been paid. While taking this action, the District tax officials determined that printed materials produced for Members of the House of Representatives were subject to sales tax and that equipment being used might be subject to application of the District of Columbia use tax.

The printing clerks were notified of

liability for back sales taxes and for sales taxes of future services performed by them for Members of the House of Representatives.

The effect of the ruling of District of Columbia tax officials regarding application of sales tax on materials produced by the House printing clerks is to impose a sales tax on any portion of the stationery account of each Member which is used to furnish paper or other materials to the printing clerks for the production of printed materials. Under the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, the full value of paper, other materials, and the services performed in printing, is subject to sales tax whether or not a sales tax was paid for paper and materials prior to placing such materials in the hands of a printer. Thus, even though a Member of the House furnishes paper and materials, such Member would be required to pay sales tax on the total cost of the paper, materials, and printing services.

It is the intent of this bill, and the language so provides, that all operations of the printing clerks performed in the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives be exempt retroactively from all sales taxes on materials or services and exempt from use taxes on all equipment in use or which may be purchased by the printing clerks to perform printing services for Members of the House of Representatives.

The majority and minority cloakroom food and beverage stands in the Capitol are operated by employees of the Federal Government, solely for the convenience of the Members of the House of Representatives during the hours when the House is in session. The cloakrooms pay District of Columbia sales tax on all equipment purchased, and also collect such sales tax on the sale of all food and beverages to the Members. By contrast, the House dining rooms and cafeterias, which dispense food and beverages to both Members and employees of the House of Representatives, and also the general public to some extent, are exempt from the collection of any sales tax. It is the view of your Committee that this situation is inequitable, and hence it has provided in H.R. 829 for the exemption of the cloakroom service operations from the District of Columbia sales tax both in the purchase of goods and in the sale of food and beverages to the Members.

This bill is identical to H.R. 1065 of the 89th Congress, as amended and passed by the House on February 8, 1965—House Report No. 20. The provisions with respect to the printing operations of the majority and minority rooms were also incorporated in H.R. 12371 of the 88th Congress, which was approved by the House on September 4, 1964—House Report No. 1846.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY], to call up bills from his subcommittee.

WATERFRONT PRIORITY HOLDERS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 2529) to amend the act of September 8, 1960, relating to the Washington Channel waterfront.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—this bill is a further attempt to establish a priority of opportunity for businesses displaced from the District of Columbia waterfront to secure reestablishment in that same area.

Public Law 86-736, enacted in July of 1960, provided that these displaced businesses were to be entitled to facilities at least substantially equal to those from which they were displaced. The RLA was to notify each displacee of an opportunity to lease a suitable piece of land in the area, and the priority holder would then have 180 days within which to indicate its intent and demonstrate its capability to establish facilities within the redevelopment plan's provisions. However, not one of these businesses has been permanently relocated, and no economically feasible offer of relocation on any specific site on the waterfront has been tendered any of them under Public Law 86-736. In short, this law has not been effective.

H.R. 2529 directs the RLA to use specific procedures to establish land values in the waterfront area, and to make proper allowances for improvements and any public charges placed upon the land which must be assumed by the priority holder. Further, it is provided that any valuation placed upon the land shall not exceed the maximum fair use value which is economically feasible and which will permit the reestablishment of the type of business displaced. Also, in the event of any change in the waterfront plan or in the land price, each priority holder must be notified and given at least 60 days within which to exercise his priority rights. The lessee shall be charged an annual rent not less than 6 percent of the fair reuse value of the land. If the cost or interest which the RLA must pay in order to finance the land and improvements exceeds 6 percent, however, then the lease rental charged the priority holder will be adjusted in excess of the 6-percent figure accordingly. Finally, if the gross income of the business exceeds the estimated figure used as a basis for establishing the residual value of the land as the basis for the original lease, the priority holder and the RLA shall receive equal shares of any increased income resulting from the increased gross sales.

After 25 years of any such lease, the land may be reappraised and a new value determined as the basis for a new rental figure.

It is my opinion that these provisions will be fair to all parties, and that the details set forth will result in a practical and working basis for the exercise of these priority rights.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2529

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (1) the first sentence of section 4(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District", approved September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 872), is amended by striking out "by reason of the enactment of the joint resolution approved August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 983; Public Law 85-821)."

(2) The second sentence of section (b) of such Act is amended by striking out "by reason of the operation of such joint resolution approved August 28, 1958."

(3) Section 4(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "The priority of opportunity created by this section is a personal right of the owners of businesses displaced. In the event of the death of any such owner of any such displaced business, the spouse of such owner, or, if there is no spouse, the children of such owner shall be entitled to exercise the priority of such owner in accordance with the provisions of this section, but in no event shall any such priority be otherwise transferable: *Provided, however,* That the spouse or the children, as the case may be, shall have no greater priority than the priority holder would have had if living. For purposes of exercising such priority, the spouse, or children, as the case may be, shall be deemed to be owner of such business concern so displaced."

(4) The last sentence in section 4(b) of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "except that if after the end of such one-hundred-and-eighty-day period the Agency shall change the terms under which real property is to be leased, or the redevelopment plan for the area described in the first section of this Act is changed so as to affect the economic value of the leasehold, the Agency shall in writing notify each such owner of the change or changes so made or give to such owner so notified a period of sixty days within which to advise the Agency in writing of his intention and to demonstrate his ability to proceed as aforesaid."

(5) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever, pursuant to subsection (b), the Agency offers leaseholds to persons entitled to a priority of opportunity to lease under the provisions of this section, the annual rent prescribed in such lease shall not exceed an amount which is the greater of—

"(A) an amount equal to 6 per centum of the residual value of the land for the prescribed use to which any owner of a displaced business concern shall put such land under such lease;

"(B) the annual amount which the Agency shall be required to pay in principal and interest on a forty-year loan of an amount equal to the residual value of the land under such lease which value is the residual value of the land which was determined by the Agency, in accordance with this subsection, and on the basis of which such land was initially leased under this section; or

"(C) the sum of (1) the amount determined under subparagraph (A) or (B) of this paragraph, whichever is greater, and (11)

50 per centum of the product of the occupancy cost factor for the class and character of the business of such lessee times the amount by which the lessee's actual annual gross sales income exceeds the estimated gross sales income (for the class and character of the displaced business) used by the Agency in determining the residual value of the land leased to such lessee.

In the case of any land which the Agency leases under this section, the annual rent prescribed by the Agency in the lease of such land shall not, during the forty-three-year period beginning on the date such land was first leased by the Agency under this section, be less than the amount determined under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph. In the case of any land which the Agency leases under this section to a displaced business, the residual value of such land—

"(I) may be redetermined by the Agency after the expiration of twenty-five years from the date such land was first leased by the Agency and at the end of each ten-year period thereafter, or

"(II) shall be redetermined by the Agency if at the end of the twenty-five-year period from the date such land was first leased by the Agency or at the end of each ten-year period thereafter, the lessee requests the Agency to redetermine such residual value.

The residual value of such land shall make due allowance for the cost to the owner of the displaced business of all improvements and public charges on such land, and shall not exceed the maximum fair use value economically feasible to permit the reestablishment of a business of the class and character of such displaced business.

"(2) Each business holding a lease under this Act shall furnish annually to the Agency (on such date as the Agency may by regulation prescribe) a copy of the sales tax return filed by such business under the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, which copy was furnished to the business under section 138 (a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2615(a))."

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

Mr. Speaker, I note in the report on this bill that the Redevelopment Land Agency for the District of Columbia has not kept its commitments with respect to these waterfront properties. My question of some member of the committee is why the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency has not kept its commitments?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I say to him that we have been insisting they do keep their commitments, but there is a great deal of resistance down there to keeping the commitments which the Congress makes relative to this particular 11 acres of land. That is the necessity for this bill. We want to require them to keep the commitments that Congress makes.

Mr. GROSS. I am in agreement with the bill, but I do not understand why this Agency has not kept the commitments that have been made. I wonder whether the Agency ought to be disbanded or whether someone ought to insist that the personnel be changed so that we can get some honest people operating this Agency.

Mr. DOWDY. Since this matter first originated, the head of the Agency has changed twice, but at least so far as this particular piece of land is concerned it does not seem to improve the situation any.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask the gentleman, or some other member of the

committee why the bill, H.R. 6638, which we understood was to be on the calendar today, is not here. That is the bill which deals with foreign chanceries in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I state to the gentleman that one of the subcommittees of my committee held extensive hearings on that bill and reported it unanimously to the floor of the House. I was advised by the House leaders that the Speaker had had some requests to carry this bill over until next week. I was not advised to take it off, but I was advised it was going to be kept off.

Mr. GROSS. The chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia means to say that the bill was reported out, is ready to be considered, and was deliberately held up from consideration today?

Mr. McMILLAN. I understand the Speaker has had some requests from some Members to hold it up until they can study the bill. That is the information I received.

Of course, I do not place the bills on the calendar. The leadership places the bills on the calendar.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina, and I wonder if the ranking minority member of the committee and author of the legislation can shed any light on the reason why his bill is not here today, as we had every reason to anticipate it would be?

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to respond to the question. I am as much in the dark as the chairman of the full committee. I had offered the bill because I felt that there should be bipartisan support for what seemed to be a very sensible approach to the chancery problem. I was quite surprised when the bill was not on the list, as we assumed it would be, but I am hopeful we will have another chance to consider it later.

Mr. GROSS. Could it be that someone else has some grandiose ideas as to the millions that would be spent? Do I understand that there is a drive on to saddle upon the taxpayers of the Nation the cost of purchasing 42 acres of expensive land in the District of Columbia for the benefit of foreign diplomats? Could this possibly be the reason?

Mr. NELSEN. I have no information as to what the reason was, I will say to my colleague. I would presume his guess would be as good as mine on this. But when I looked at the tax revenue that the Washington Circle property brought to the District of Columbia as compared to the tax revenues that the other property brought and the cost of it, it seemed to me from a sound point of view that the chancery area that was proposed was the logical thing to purchase for chancery purposes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we just heard a message read from the President which calls for the expenditure of an additional—I emphasize—"an additional"—\$1.5 billion to be spewed out over Latin America for the alleged good of mankind. I do not know all the al-

leged purposes. I will have to read the bill of particulars.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know how we can enter into real estate deals in the District of Columbia costing more than \$100 million, according to some estimates, and still have money to explode all over Latin America. Somewhere we are going to have to cut down. I think this would have been a good day to have brought in H.R. 6338 because of the limitations that it places on this nefarious deal being attempted in the District of Columbia. If there is going to be additional money spent on Latin America, we are going to have to deprive the people of this country to get it unless this Government is plunged deeper into debt.

THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL DRINKING CLUB

Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star reported on February 16 that under questioning of members of the House District of Columbia Committee the State Department spokesman, James W. Symington, Chief of Protocol, Department of State, conceded that foreign governments "could buy individual parcels of land in the north Foggy Bottom area without the approval of the enclave plan." The Star report went on to say:

Symington was asked why the enclave had to be located in 'prime area' thus removing large amount of valuable land from District tax rolls.

Symington suggested that the committee call officials of the National Capital Planning Commission to determine why the State Department had to locate its enclave plan in Foggy Bottom.

I have taken the trouble to look at the National Capital Planning Commission plan for the proposed International Center. It takes up several pages of the proposed \$8 billion plan for the National Capital known as "The Proposed Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital." This International Center plan was worked on and developed as a cooperative effort, by the White House, the State Department, and the NCPC staff and has now been sent to the Congress in legislative form by the President. We are being asked to adopt it and to enact it into law.

I did not put the \$8 billion price tag on this so-called comprehensive plan for 1985 which includes the International Center and an international drinking club, the newspapers did. But I would hazard a pretty safe guess that if this fantastic sum is ever paid it will be paid by the people of this Nation, and not by the people of the District of Columbia, since the District has contributed almost no cash at all to date to its \$200 million urban renewal program. In fact, the last figure I saw of the amount of cash contributed locally to this program was about \$5,000, which is peanuts.

Now I invite your attention specifically

to pages 50 through 57 of the White House-State Department-NCPC International Center plan in the comprehensive plan for 1985, by which time it is supposed to be a reality; where we find this nugget of information on page 51:

The International Center and its immediate surroundings should include not only official activities, such as chanceries and organizational headquarters, but supporting services, such as restaurants, shops, and hotels. The center would become the focal point of international activities in Washington.

Why should the American taxpayers contribute land at \$4 million an acre to subsidize locations for new restaurants, shops, and hotels to compete with those now in Washington? The International Center plan, which the President has asked the Congress to enact into law, will also provide for an "international club," and this appears on page 52 in these words:

The blocks between M and N Streets from New Hampshire Avenue to Rock Creek Park would form the heart of the center. Here there would be a central core development on a raised plaza. As the focus of the core, several office buildings would house special missions and international organizations and could serve for interim chancery use. In addition, an international club might be established as a center for diplomatic functions, with meeting and reception facilities.

Two things become clear. The Congress is being asked to subsidize locations for new office buildings. Further, the Congress is being asked to subsidize "an international club" as a center for diplomatic functions, with meetings and reception facilities.

Here, in a nutshell, is the plan the President is backing, the plan for which the District Committee bill was side-tracked. I have looked at the District Committee bill, H.R. 6638, and there are no subsidized locations for "restaurants, shops, and hotels, several office buildings or an international club," which is undoubtedly the real reason it was side-tracked. If the President took this international drinking club out of the plan he is asking the Congress to authorize, and if he dropped the subsidized locations for restaurants, shops, hotels, and several office buildings which his plan provides for, he would not need even as much acreage as the District Committee bill, H.R. 6638 now provides at low cost for chancery use and for a headquarters site for the Organization of American States.

If any of the Members of this House doubts that the President's plan for the International Center has an international drinking club in it, I invite you to take a hard look at the plan as it is set out in all of its "lush" details in this State Department-NCPC comprehensive plan.

I say "lush" details advisedly, because such a plush international club will undoubtedly attract most of the Great Society's national hard-drinking set as well as the State Department's international drinking crowd, and the international jet-set drinking crowd.

Since the American taxpayers are being called upon to pick up the tab for the proposed international club as well as the International Center, under the plan

which the President sent up to the Congress last week, we can expect the taxpayers of our country, those who are still solvent in your districts and mine, to be called upon by the State Department to pick up the drinking tab at the newly proposed international club.

We can expect, in addition, that all of the exotic drinks of the 113 nations with embassies and chanceries in Washington will insist that their national drinks be served there, probably with their national flags flying.

We doubt that any of the national and international "go-go" types which frequent the night-life spots in Washington under the Great Society, and who will gravitate inevitably to the State Department's international club, will insist on dairy milk produced by the plain old American dairy cows being served there.

Recently I read a Rambler column in the Evening Star protesting the State Department plan. This was on February 7, and the column, written by John McKelway, was prophetic. The Rambler column concluded this way:

"Why wipe out a whole area that seems to be getting better and better? Of course, it would make getting to cocktail parties much simpler. But there must be something else to foreign relations.

There is indeed, and this seems to be an excellent time to remind the White House and the State Department of this fact.

For years the State Department has been coming up to the Congress with its hands out asking for "representational" funds to provide free drinks for foreign nationals in our American embassies overseas.

Now this line of thinking has come full circle, and the President is now asking the Congress to provide an international club for the lonesome international drinking set, the international jet-set, and the "go-go", and body-stocking types, which hang out around town looking for free drinks.

A few years ago we had the swimming pool set here in Washington, and this tax-supported international club will spawn a whole new crowd which, if the Congress approves this White House-State Department International Center plan, will set international relations back a hundred years.

We can look forward to credit cards for the international club with a direct pipeline to the U.S. Treasury Department that will make drinking painless for everybody but the American taxpayers. In addition to the international club credit cards, we can expect international club bunnies and all of the other joyous things of the key club sets. The Congress is entitled to know more, a great deal more, about this international club and this international center before it takes up the White House-State Department Plan for the International Center, and the international club.

There is nothing in the legislation which the President sent to the Congress last week which gives the slightest indication that the State Department has discarded the idea of having new hotels and restaurants in the proposed International Center. In fact, the White House-State Department-NCPC plan for the

International Center specifically calls for "restaurants, shops, and hotels" on page 51 of the NCPD Comprehensive Report which I cited earlier.

It is high time the President leveled with the American people on this gaudy International Center plan, because it is clear that the Department of State is talking out of both sides of its mouth about this project, and the whole business should be quickly put on the junk heap.

There seems to be no limit to which the administration and the Great Society is prepared to go to refurbish its sagging image, but this plan will make it sag further. This proposed International Center stretches the bounds of credulity to unprecedented limits even for the Great Society, and the international club which the President has asked the Congress to underwrite along with the subsidized locations for new hotels and restaurants and office buildings has widened the credibility gap to a yawning chasm, and the plan is extravagantly wasteful and unnecessary.

In his February 27 message to the Congress on the International Center the President said he would recommend legislation "consistent with the legitimate interests of District citizens." Yet there is no provision in the State Department-White House plan to provide new jobs or otherwise compensate thousands of District citizens who will lose well-paid jobs if it is adopted. The District and Federal Governments will lose millions of dollars in taxes, and businesses will be displaced, or unfairly competed with.

This administration has botched the Federal urban renewal program, and vacant areas stand idle in scores of American cities. This plan will make a wasteland of one of the city's fastest developing commercial and residential areas which is attracting taxpayers back to the area, providing jobs, and paying taxes.

Why should the Federal Government donate land to the OAS and foreign governments costing \$4 million or more an acre when it is entirely unconstitutional, as shown in the case of *Kohl v. United States*, 91 U.S. 367, which states that:

The proper view of the right of eminent domain seems to be that it is the right belonging to a sovereignty to take property for its own use and not for those of another.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman, returning to H.R. 2529, if the amendments herein are the same as passed the House and the Senate in the 89th Congress on a similar bill.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. That is correct. It is what was agreed to between the House and the Senate but which did not get to final enactment because the Congress adjourned. Yes. That is right.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 2529, is to amend

the act of September 8, 1960—74 Stat. 871, District of Columbia Code, title 5, sections 720-726—relating to the Washington Channel waterfront, by providing supplementary directives to the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia for the relocation of displaced businesses in conformity with the urban renewal development plans for the waterfront portion of area C, urban renewal project in Southwest Washington.

HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION

The Washington Channel waterfront of the Potomac River, title to which area was in the United States, was included within the boundaries of the project area C of the urban renewal redevelopment plan for Southwest Washington. This area, owned by the Federal Government, had, for a long period of years, been under the jurisdiction and control of the government of the District of Columbia. In 1913, on part of the waterfront area, the District of Columbia erected a fish market building and leased the market stalls to the fish dealers and to restaurant operators.

As a part of the redevelopment program for Southwest Washington, the Southwest Freeway was to run through the project area, and one of the approaches to the freeway was to pass over Maine Avenue at 11th and 12th Streets and part of the supporting structures would have to be located on the land occupied by the market building.

ACTION IN 85TH CONGRESS

To facilitate this redevelopment, legislation was introduced and passed in the 85th Congress—House Joint Resolution 630, 72 Statutes 983—to authorize the use of the land and the removal of the market facilities. At your committee hearings on this legislation, the representatives of the government of the District of Columbia and of the Redevelopment Land Agency presented testimony as to the need for the legislation. At the same hearings, the owners of small businesses which had occupied the market building, in some instances for more than a generation, testified concerning the effect of the legislation upon their businesses. These lessees of the market building proposed amendments to the pending legislation which would have provided for their relocation and continuation in business on the Washington Channel waterfront. The suggested amendments would have required the government of the District of Columbia to build facilities for lease solely to those displaced by the freeway construction or the urban renewal plan. In view of the testimony and a commitment by representatives of the Redevelopment Land Agency to provide temporary and permanent locations for businesses which might be displaced, your committee did not approve the proposed amendments and observed, in its report accompanying House Joint Resolution 630—House Report No. 2525, 85th Congress, second session—as follows:

The committee was convinced from testimony given to the subcommittee by representatives of the Redevelopment Land Agency for the District of Columbia that a sincere desire existed to take every possible

step to provide temporary and permanent locations for businesses which might be displaced by this legislation.

The committee feels that this objective can be best obtained if a spirit of cooperation is manifested between the Redevelopment Land Agency, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the tenants who might be involved.

The committee urges all concerned to deal in the spirit of cooperation. If the committee feels that this is not being done it will take the matter up subsequently for consideration and possible legislation.

Following the enactment of this legislation in 1958, the construction of the approaches to the Southwest Freeway began and the Redevelopment Land Agency thereafter undertook the demolition and removal of the facilities in the project area.

In order to exercise full authority over the Washington Channel waterfront and to redevelop it according to the urban renewal plan, it was necessary for the Redevelopment Land Agency to secure authority transferring title to the waterfront area from the Federal Government to the Agency before it could legally proceed with redevelopment.

ACTION IN 86TH CONGRESS

Accordingly, legislation was introduced in the second session of the 86th Congress authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting for the U.S. Government, to transfer and donate to the Redevelopment Land Agency all right, title, and interest to so much of the area as was necessary to carry out the urban renewal plan. Such legislation—S. 3648; 74 Stat. 871—was first passed by the other body and came on to your committee for further action.

During hearings on the above bill, testimony was again received from the District of Columbia officials, the Redevelopment Land Agency, and the owners of displaced businesses in the waterfront area. Witnesses testifying before your committee indicated clearly that essentially nothing has been accomplished since the enactment of House Joint Resolution 630 in 1958, for the permanent relocation of the businesses displaced from the waterfront area and only one had been provided with a temporary location. The Redevelopment Land Agency advised your committee that negotiations were in process with some businesses. These businesses were identified as the Flagship Restaurant and Hogate's Restaurant.

Since no relocation was in prospect for the waterfront displacees pursuant to the statements of the Redevelopment Land Agency, your committee amended the terms of S. 3648 to provide that displacees from the waterfront area would be given a priority of relocation with the understanding that the priority would likewise extend to the Flagship Restaurant and to Hogate's Restaurant.

That bill, S. 3648, as amended and enacted, provided that displaced businesses would receive priority of opportunity to lease land either individually or as a development company solely owned by the owner or owners of one or more of such business concerns. The displaced businesses were to be entitled to facilities at

least substantially equal to the facilities from which they were displaced and to be in conformity with the urban renewal plan for the area. The Redevelopment Land Agency was to notify each of the displaced business concerns of an opportunity to lease a parcel of land within the waterfront area. Each business was to be allowed 180 days within which to indicate its intent to relocate in the area and to demonstrate its capability to establish facilities in accordance with the redevelopment plan.

The purpose of directing the Agency to provide such priorities was to make effective the previous pledges of the Redevelopment Land Agency, and the acceptance of those pledges by the Congress, that those businesses displaced from the area would have a reasonable and first opportunity to reestablish their businesses. The priority right was provided solely for the benefit of displacees who were ready, willing, and able to reestablish their business, and such right was not to be available for transfer, sale, or disposition otherwise in full or in part to other persons.

WATERFRONT REDEVELOPMENT PLANS

Development of urban renewal plans for the Washington Channel waterfront dates from the original commitment in 1954 of the waterfront area to the Webb & Knapp Co., which later completely defaulted in its performance. After several attempts, a plan for the waterfront was approved by the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Commissioners. The execution of the plan then became the obligation of the Redevelopment Land Agency. Early in the 88th Congress your committee held hearings on the waterfront plan. Testimony taken by the committee at that time created substantial doubts as to the feasibility and desirability of the plan. Owners of displaced businesses presented specific criticisms although none of them, at that time, had been informed concerning the probable nature of any leases which might be offered to them.

About 1 year later, in February 1964, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency issued notice to business displacees having priority for relocation. This notice advised the holders of priorities that they would have a period of 180 days within which to indicate their purpose to exercise their priority and to demonstrate their capacity to reestablish their businesses and construct facilities in accordance with the waterfront redevelopment plan. Priority holders were also notified concerning the terms of leases and other performances to be required of them by the Agency.

On examining the terms of the leases offered, the priority holders found themselves presented with an economic impossibility. The leaseholds offered to displacees were essentially "air rights." They were required to construct parking facilities underneath the business area, and such parking facilities were to be available to the public. Thus, individual businesses, while providing parking space, could not reserve such space, limited as it was, for its own customers. The building, which must conform to

the waterfront plan, had to be financed and built by the owner and was to be occupied for a limited period of years, at the end of which time the property right in the building rested with the Redevelopment Land Agency. The nature of the use of any structure was strictly limited to the purposes of the displaced business. Substantial setbacks from the boundaries of each parcel were required. The height of the building was limited to two floors.

The land values established by the Agency, as a basis for determining the lease rental rates to priority holders, was set by the Agency at a level far exceeding that set for most other parcels in the Southwest urban renewal project area. When this land cost was added to other charges placed on a priority holder, it appeared conclusive that no displaced business, regardless of its financial strength, could hope to operate at a profit.

After a record on these matters had been established with the Agency, the Agency reduced the land costs to the displacees by approximately 10 percent. This action proved to be a gesture since most, if not all, the displacees found the Agency's proposal economically impossible, regardless of the financial abilities of the displaced businesses.

During the 180-day period beginning in February 1964, displacees who were interested in relocation on the waterfront so notified the Agency. Thereafter, conferences and discussions between priority holders and the Agency were held. At the expiration of the 180-day period, no lease contracts had been executed, and, in fact, the priority holders had not been offered any specific parcels for relocation.

ACTION IN 89TH CONGRESS

Thereafter, your committee held additional hearings in connection with the waterfront relocation problem during the 89th Congress. At these hearings, further testimony was received from displaced businesses. Your committee also took the testimony of banking officials and private appraisers with relation to the valuations placed upon the waterfront land and the economic feasibility of financing a structure under the terms of leases proposed by the Agency.

The banking representatives advised the committee that such a lease as proposed by the Agency was wholly unsuitable as a basis on which to grant financing to displacees for the construction and equipment of the necessary buildings.

Testimony by expert appraisers indicated that the land prices established by RLA were probably at least double any reasonable appraisal under the limitations imposed as to land coverage, parking requirements, floor area, and usage.

The Redevelopment Land Agency, in the face of expert testimony showing that the terms of the lease were economically impossible, initiated a review of the land appraisals for possible further adjustment. Such appraisal was completed in May 1965, but the priority holders have received no further word from the Agency indicating the possibility of further negotiations.

Since the 180-day period provided by statute had run out and no contracts had been completed, some question appeared as to whether priority rights might be extinguished or otherwise lost in the event the Agency were to make a change in the waterfront plans or a change in the land price or conditions of lease. To avoid such possibility and to further supplement the already abundantly expressed intent of Congress as to the relocation of displaced waterfront businesses, your committee recommended legislation to preserve the priority rights of displaced businesses and provide a formula for the determination of the fair reuse value of such lands for the purposes specified in the plan.

That legislation—H.R. 11428, 89th Congress—was favorably reported and approved by the House of Representatives. Following hearings in the Senate, the bill was amended and reported favorably to the Senate. After approval by the Senate, the bill was returned to the House, was amended by the House, and returned again to the Senate. The bill as so amended was not reached for scheduling on the Senate Calendar in the last days of the 89th Congress.

Following the first approval of H.R. 11428 in the House of Representatives, amendments were proposed to the Senate to provide means by which the Redevelopment Land Agency might capture any profits in excess of those estimated as a basis for establishing the fair reuse value of the lease by the residual appraisal method. The bill was amended by the Senate so as to permit the Redevelopment Land Agency, at its option, to reappraise the value of the land and increase the lease rental rates to such levels as the Agency deemed appropriate.

Before further House action on the bill as amended by the Senate, your committee examined carefully into the effects of the Senate amendments. Banking and financial institutions in the District of Columbia were consulted to determine whether or not the terms of the amended bill were such as to expect that such institutions would finance the buildings and equipments which the waterfront priority holders would be required to construct under any lease. Without exception, your committee was advised that the amendments at least imposed serious obstacles to such financing if not making it entirely impossible. The effect of the amendments in question was to permit a third party acting unilaterally to place increased charges on the gross revenues of a business without any certainty that any remainder of the gross would be sufficient to successfully operate the business and meet the mortgage obligation.

The Redevelopment Land Agency was requested to develop a formula which would not interfere with normal financing of a displaced business but which would give the Agency a share in any increased income to the respective businesses and at the same time provide an incentive to the businesses to increase business volume. After many conferences with the Agency, such a formula was developed and suitable amendments were prepared to the bill and approved by the House. Representatives of the Redevelopment Land Agency advised of their

approval of the amendments and made such representations when the amended bill was returned to the Senate. However, in the brief time remaining at the end of the 89th Congress, the other body did not conclude action on the bill.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

Approximately 8 years have passed since the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency pledged to the Congress that the small businesses on the waterfront would be permanently relocated in the course of redevelopment of the Washington Channel waterfront. None of the businesses has been permanently relocated, and in fact no economically feasible offer of relocation of any specific site has been tendered to any of the displaced businesses under the specific priorities provided by act of Congress. The Agency has failed to meet its repeated commitments to your committee and to the Congress.

This legislation is necessary to assure the preservation of the priorities for the relocation of the small businesses displaced from the waterfront as provided by act of Congress. Without this legislation there is no assurance that any of the displaced businesses will be relocated on sites on the Washington Channel waterfront.

WHAT THE BILL PROVIDES

The pending bill, H.R. 2529, includes the formula approved by RLA and is identical to H.R. 11428, as amended and finally approved by the House in the last Congress.

Briefly, the bill provides for equal priority rights to all businesses displaced from the waterfront area, some of which were inadvertently not included in Public Law 86-736. Those previously not entitled to notice are to receive notice of an opportunity to exercise a priority right for the reestablishment of their businesses.

Your committee considers that no priority right of any displacee who has, pursuant to notice, indicated his desire to reestablish his business has been extinguished.

Further, in the event of any change in the waterfront plan or in the land price or other matters which affect the economic values of a lease, each priority holder must be notified and given at least 60 days within which to exercise his priority rights.

In view of the problems which have been described heretofore, your committee is impelled to deal, at least generally, with the matter of setting for displaced businesses some criteria to be followed by the RLA in the appraisal of parcels of land made available for relocation. Because of the numerous requirements and limitations placed upon the use of the land and upon the waterfront priority holder, this becomes essential.

Accordingly, in section 4 of the bill, the Agency is directed to use specific procedures for the establishment of land values in the waterfront area, and it must take into account the limitations and make proper allowances for improvements and any public charges placed upon the land which must be assumed by the priority holder. Further, it is provided that any valuation placed upon the land shall not exceed the maximum fair

use value which is economically feasible and which will permit the reestablishment of the business. These elements are essentially those used by competent appraisers. The principles are found in standard appraisal reference publications under the heading of residual appraisals—"Real Estate Appraisal and Investment," Kahn, Case, and Schimmel, page 146; McMichaels Appraising Manual, fourth edition, 11th printing, pages 42-43.

Your committee also observes that residual appraisals have been used elsewhere by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency in its disposition of urban renewal lands. It is felt that such appraisal methods, if not the only suitable methods, are certainly one of the best and fully justifiable in connection with relocation of small businesses on land on the Washington Channel waterfront.

The bill provides that the lessee shall be charged an annual rent not less than 6 percent of the fair reuse value of the land as established by the Agency. In the event the money cost or interest which the Agency must pay in order to finance the land and improvements exceeds 6 percent, the lease rental charged to the priority holder will be such amount above 6 percent as is necessary to finance the land and improvement costs incurred by the Agency. Further if the gross income derived by the business exceeds the estimated income used as a basis in establishing the residual value of the land as a basis for the original lease, the bill provides that the priority holder and the Agency shall receive equal shares of any increased income resulting from the increased gross sales.

In addition, the bill provides that at the end of the first 25 years of any lease, the land under lease may be reappraised and a new value set on the basis of which the lease rental may be redetermined. This appraisal may occur at the option of the Agency or must be made by the Agency if the lessee so requests. Either the Agency or the lessee may request a new appraisal at the end of each 10-year interval following the 25th year of lease.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in connection with any of these bills.

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

There was no objection.

H.R. 3370 TO WAIVE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD EXAMS FOR PODIATRISTS FOR HOLDERS OF NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATES PASSED OVER TO NEXT DISTRICT DAY

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that by request H.R. 3370, to waive District of Columbia Board exams

for podiatrists for holders of national board certificates, is being withdrawn from the District of Columbia docket today and will be passed over to the next District day. I believe that is No. 9 on our list.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for the purpose of calling up any bills which he desires to call at this time from the subcommittee which he chairs.

CLAIMS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN ESCHEAT CASES

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 834) to amend section 5 of the Act of February 11, 1929, to remove the dollar limit on the authority of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims of the District of Columbia in escheat cases, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I certainly would like to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], the gentleman who is bringing this bill up for the consideration of the House today, if the provisions of this bill would allow an open-ended, unlimited amount that can be settled by the Commissioners, with court approval; and, if so, does he feel that such compromises could run above \$15,000 or to even \$25,000?

Mr. Speaker, I have read the report and I have also read the bill as well as the prior bill, and in my opinion, this simply allows, in escheat cases, the Commissioners—and I am glad they have added the words "with court approval"—have unlimited settlement authority or compromise powers far above the \$10,000 prior limitation.

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, this legislation was requested by the District Commissioners.

As the gentleman from Missouri has well said, the committee added a proviso to the effect that no such settlement in escheat cases can be made without the approval of the U.S. district court.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this, in my opinion, is a reasonable provision. We do not leave it to the Corporation Counsel or the District Commissioners to make this decision entirely. They have to go into the court and obtain court approval in order to do this. Also, as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] will note, the legislation does not propose any radical change, except here in the District of Columbia. In the gentleman's great State of Missouri, and in my own home State, the great State of North Carolina, and insofar as I know, in every other jurisdiction, the individual State would have a right to settle any sort of lawsuit in which the State

is a party that was pending in court, without such limiting conditions.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from North Carolina will yield further, I well understand what the gentleman is saying, and I understand the fact that without a limitation of \$10,000 that the Commissioners could compromise in this fashion—

First. We are simply making this come into the courts;

Second. It might be more costly to the Commissioners in the case of long and drawn-out litigation in the courts, than the amount involved in the legacy, or estate; or

Third. It would conform to the other States and territories.

However, Mr. Speaker, my question still has not been answered: Does it make this an unlimited amount under which they could compromise?

Mr. WHITENER. This would not involve a legacy. This would involve escheat only. It does not in any way involve a legacy.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina please answer my question?

Does this or does it not involve in escheat cases an unlimited amount at which the Commissioners can compromise?

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, absolutely, but with the approval of the U.S. district court.

Mr. HALL. Then the gentleman from North Carolina feels that this is reasonable and responsible legislation?

Mr. WHITENER. Frankly, it is my opinion that it has not been reasonable and responsible that the District government could not have done this years before. We must trust the lawyers of the District of Columbia's government, the heads of the government plus the U.S. district court judge, who has the case before him, to look after the public interest.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation and, as a nonlegally trained man, I am simply asking as one elected legislator for this explanation. I believe the gentleman has tried. I do not believe that we should necessarily accept this legislation without objection, especially when it is unlimited or open-ended without thoroughly understanding it, and I rose only in that purview.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 834

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first proviso of section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia", approved February 11, 1929 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-906), is amended by inserting "except, with the approval of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, a

claim or suit under section 19-701 of the District of Columbia Code," immediately after "no claim or suit so compromised".

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 834 is to amend the act of February 11, 1929 (65 Stat. 131), District of Columbia Code, title 1, section 906, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting for the District, to settle a disputed claim regarding the surplus of a decedent's estate to which the District is a statutory escheatee, by accepting a percentage of the net assets of the estate where such compromise would result in a reduction of more than \$10,000 in the amount of the claim against the estate.

EXISTING LAW

The type of claim which is the concern of this proposed legislation may arise under title 19, section 701 of the District of Columbia Code, which provides:

Where there is no surviving spouse or relations of the intestate within the fifth degree reckoned by counting down from the common ancestor to the more remote, the surplus of real and personal property escheats to the District of Columbia to be used by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the benefit of the poor.

Annually, there are between 5 and 15 cases where a person dies in the District of Columbia as to whom it is believed there are no heirs. Commonly, after publication of notice, people come forward as claimants under law against the estate. In such cases, as noted hereafter, the burden of proof which falls upon the District of Columbia may be very substantial. In such situations, it may be highly desirable and advantageous to the District of Columbia to be able to compromise such claims.

The authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to compromise any claim is strictly limited by the act of February 11, 1929, as amended—District of Columbia Code, title 1, section 906—which provides:

SEC. 5. That upon a report by the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia showing in detail the just and true amount and condition of any claim or suit which the District of Columbia may now or hereafter have against any person, firm, association, or corporation, and the terms upon which the same may be compromised, and stating that in his opinion the compromise of such claim would be for the best interest of the District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they hereby are, authorized to compromise such claim or suit accordingly: *Provided, however, That no claim or suit so compromised shall be reduced by an amount greater than \$10,000: And provided further, That this section shall not apply to claims or suits for taxes or special assessments.*

Thus, regardless of the desirability and benefit to the District of Columbia, no compromise may be made by the District in an escheat case if the compromise would result in a reduction of more than \$10,000 in the amount of the claim.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

As noted above, the surplus of an estate escheats to the District of Columbia on proof that there is no surviving spouse or relative of the deceased within

the fifth degree counting down from the common ancestor to the more remote. The burden of proof of the District was established in the case of *Frazier v. Kutz*, decided by the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia on December 13, 1943—139 Fed. 2d 380. In that case, the court said:

In every case of this nature there is a presumption of law that the deceased left heirs, and this presumption obtains until the claimant by escheat overcomes the presumption by strong and convincing evidence.

To comply with the standards of proof required by the courts, the District of Columbia often finds it necessary to trace the ancestry of the deceased through a series of generations to determine whether or not there is an ancestor having progeny who may or may not inherit. This may involve extensive searches of records in foreign countries to examine the validity of claims and the authenticity of foreign documents. Where records have been destroyed by conflagrations, or due to wartime destruction, it may be extremely costly or even impossible to establish essential facts of relationship. Claimants may be scattered in different nations and they would have to come to this jurisdiction themselves or by designation of representatives to testify affirmatively because of the questioned validity of or the lack of documentary proof which might otherwise support a disposition of the estate.

Where such circumstances exist, it may require expenditures which would consume a substantial part of or all of the net estate and involve several years of time for the District to resolve a case.

During a public hearing before Subcommittee No. 5 on August 1, 1966, testimony was presented regarding the difficulties which may be involved under existing provisions of law, and the committee was advised of specific cases now pending which involve such elements of uncertainty as might be best resolved to the benefit of the District of Columbia through a compromise agreement which compromise would involve a reduction by an amount greater than \$10,000. No objections were voiced to the purpose and language of the bill. Accordingly, your committee finds that the proposed legislation is reasonable and desirable.

In the course of committee deliberations on the proposed legislation, consideration was given to the desirability of some court supervision over compromises proposed in connection with escheat cases. Your committee concluded that such supervision would simplify the problem of securing bond for the administrator, protect the administrator if later issue was raised by some disgruntled party, and protect the District government as to any question which might be raised concerning the propriety of the compromise. Accordingly, the committee at that time amended the bill so as to require that any compromise in escheat cases should have the approval of the U.S. court for the District of Columbia.

This bill is identical to H.R. 15706 of the 89th Congress, which passed the House on August 5, 1966—House Report No. 1817.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia on February 24, 1967, expressed their approval of this proposed legislation in a letter to the committee.

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

LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks immediately before the passage of the last bill, and also the same request immediately before the passing of any other bills that I call up.

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

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL CEREMONIES ACT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 827) to amend the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 827

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1203) is amended (a) by striking "travel expenses of enforcement personnel from other jurisdictions" and inserting in lieu thereof "travel expenses of enforcement personnel, including sanitarians, from other jurisdictions"; and (b) by striking "policemen and firemen" and inserting in lieu thereof "policemen, firemen, and other municipal employees".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Immediately after the enacting clause, insert the following:

"That section 2 of the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act approved August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1049; D.C. Code, sec. 1-1202) is amended by adding the following:

"The Commissioners are also authorized to issue, for both duly registered motor vehicles and unregistered motor vehicles made available for the use of the Inaugural Committee, special registration tags, valid for a period not exceeding 90 days, designed to celebrate the occasion of the Inauguration of the President and Vice President."

On line 3, strike out "That section 3" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 2. Section 3".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I note on page 3 of the report that this bill will provide for the relocating of streetcar platforms. I wonder if there are any streetcars operating in the District of Columbia these days?

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I might say, as I understand it from the staff of our committee, that that refers

to the streetcar or bus platforms. When we had streetcars they were referred to as "streetcar platforms," and the nomenclature seems to still exist, even though we now are operating only motor buses.

I do not believe it is a very difficult proposition, Mr. Speaker. They also have to move some lampposts when they have parades down the center of Pennsylvania Avenue, and some folks down my way call them "lightposts" instead of "lampposts."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be a little more appropriate to relocate some of the streetcar tracks that Mr. Chalk has not gotten rid of and which add a traffic hazard, especially in wet weather, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. WHITENER. Yes; I imagine it would be a good idea to get rid of them.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 827, is to amend the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act of 1956—70 Stat. 1049; District of Columbia Code, title 1, section 1201 and the following—in three particulars, as follows:

First. To provide for the payment of travel expenses of "sanitarians"—expert health advisers—whom the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are already authorized to employ, on a temporary basis, to promote adequate inspection and enforcement of health regulations during the inaugural period.

Second. To provide meals for employees of the Health Department and other municipal employees, who are required to remain on duty at their posts through meal times during such inaugural period, many of them being stationed along the line of march of the inaugural parade. The act now authorizes such meals for police and firemen.

Third. To authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners to issue special registration tags to both registered and unregistered motor vehicles available for use by the Inaugural Committee, designed to commemorate the occasion of the inauguration, and valid for a period not to exceed 90 days.

Section 2 of this bill is identical to H.R. 6143 of the 89th Congress, which passed the House on August 22, 1966—H. Rept. No. 1816.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Section 1 is an amendment to the original bill, and was adopted by your committee at the request of the D.C. Board of Commissioners. The Commissioners' letter dated March 7, 1967, requesting this amendment, is quoted in pertinent part as follows:

The Commissioners desire to expand their report of February 24 so as to recommend a further amendment of the Act. They believe it desirable that the Act include authority for the issuance, both to duly registered motor vehicles and to unregistered motor vehicles made available for the use of the Inaugural Committee, of special registration tags, valid for a period not exceeding 90 days, designed to celebrate the occasion of the Inauguration of the President and Vice President.

BACKGROUND

Under the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act referred to, the Commis-

sioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure the preservation of public order and protection of life, health, and property; to make special regulations respecting the standing, movement, and operation of vehicles of whatever character or kind during said period; and to grant, under such conditions as they may impose, special licenses to peddlers and vendors for the privilege of selling goods, wares, and merchandise in such places in the District of Columbia, and to charge such fees for such privilege, as they may deem proper; protect the public health, but they also study the District practices and make a report thereon to the local authorities.

The act referred to also authorizes the appropriation of—and in the past the Congress has appropriated—such sums as are necessary to enable the Commissioners to provide additional municipal services in said District during the inaugural period, including employment of personal services without regard to the civil service and classification laws; travel expenses of enforcement personnel from other jurisdictions; hire of means of transportation; meals for policemen and firemen, cost of removing and relocating streetcar platforms, construction, rent, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public comfort stations, first-aid stations, and information booths; and other incidental expenses in the discretion of the Commissioners.

However, as presently construed, this authority does not permit payment of travel expenses of sanitarians, nor meals for municipal employees referred to—other than police and firemen—who are required to remain on duty through mealtimes.

The reported bill corrects these omissions and provides authority for payment thereof.

PRECEDENTS FOR THE LEGISLATION

The Congress has already, in several acts passed since the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act of 1956, enacted into law provisions identical to those in your reported bill to cover travel expenses of sanitarians, and meals for municipal employees, as for example:

House joint resolution 888—Public Law 88-1836, approved July 28, 1964—and House joint resolution 195—Public Law 1178, approved July 19, 1966—to authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners to promulgate special regulations for the July 1965 and July 1967 Washington conventions of the Imperial Council Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobels of the Mystic Shrine for North America.

House joint resolution 195—Public Law 89-25, approved May 22, 1965—giving the District of Columbia Commissioners similar authority with respect to the American Legion Convention held in Washington August 29–September 1, 1966.

HEARING

The enactment of this legislation was urged by representatives of the District of Columbia Commissioners and the District of Columbia Department of Public Health at a public hearing before Sub-

committee No. 5 on August 1, 1966. No opposition to the bill has been expressed to your committee.

The Board of Commissioners recommended this entire legislation.

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

TO AMEND THE ACT ENTITLED "AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR COMMITMENTS TO, MAINTENANCE IN, AND DISCHARGE FROM, THE DISTRICT TRAINING SCHOOL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES," APPROVED MARCH 3, 1925, AS AMENDED

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H.R. 3371) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3371

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That an Act entitled "An Act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1135), as amended (sec. 32.601 et seq. D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended as follows:

Whenever the terms "the District Training School", "Board of Public Welfare", "said board", "feeble minded", "inmate", "inmates", and "an inmate" occur in such Act approved March 3, 1925, they shall be stricken, and the terms "Forest Haven", "Department of Public Welfare", "said Department", "mentally retarded", "patient", "patients", and "a patient", respectively, inserted in lieu thereof.

(2) Section 2 is amended to read as follows: "The words 'mentally retarded persons' in this Act shall be construed to mean any person afflicted with mental defectiveness from birth or from an early age, so pronounced that he is incapable of managing himself and his affairs, and who requires supervision, control, and care for his own welfare, or for the welfare of others, or for the welfare of the community, and is not insane nor of unsound mind to such an extent as to require his commitment to a hospital for the mentally ill."

(3) The first sentence of section 14 is amended by inserting after "If the order for admission is as a public patient" the words "or if the patient is admitted under the provisions of section 30 of this Act".

(4) The first sentence of section 15 is amended by inserting after the words "If the order for admission is as a public patient" the words "or if the patient is admitted under the provisions of section 30 of this Act".

(5) By adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 30. (a) Subject to the provisions of this Act and in addition to the preceding sections, the Director of Public Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the Director) may admit to Forest Haven as a patient any adult

who has been a resident of the District of Columbia for one year next preceding the date of application of any child under the age of twenty-one (1) who is certified by the Director of Public Health to be mentally retarded and in need of care at Forest Haven, and at least one of whose parents or legal guardian has been a resident of the said District for one year next preceding the date of application; (2) who, either by himself, his parents, his spouse, or his legal guardian makes written application for admission to Forest Haven; and (3) who does not express, either to the Director of Public Health or Public Welfare, his objection to being so admitted.

"(b) Any person admitted to Forest Haven pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be released therefrom no more than five days after receipt by the Superintendent of Forest Haven of a written request for release: *Provided*, That if within such five-day period a petition concerning such person, as provided by section 7, shall be filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, such person shall be detained until a final judgment is entered by the court upon said petition.

"(c) The Director may discharge any patient of Forest Haven admitted pursuant to authority contained in this section if the Director is satisfied that such discharge will not adversely affect the welfare or interests of the mentally retarded person, the community, or others.

"(d) (1) If the Director finds that any person with respect to whom an application for admission to Forest Haven has been made, as provided in this section, or any parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian of such person, is able to pay all or any part of the cost of maintenance and care of such person, the Director shall not admit such person unless a contract for payment, satisfactory to the Director, be executed by such person, parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian.

"(2) The Director is authorized to enter into any agreement he deems necessary with any applicant to become a patient in Forest Haven, or with his parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian, for payment to the District of Columbia of all or part of the cost of such maintenance and care. Upon default of payment provided by any contract entered into under this section, the Director is authorized to discharge any patient of Forest Haven and, in addition, he may utilize the procedures provided for in sections 14 and 15 of this Act to secure payment.

"(e) The Director, with the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be performed by the Board of Commissioners or may be delegated by said Board in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The CLERK. On page 5, after line 15, add the following:

SECTION 1. The first four sections of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, is amended as follows:

(1) The first section of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 32-601) is amended—

(A) by striking out "feeble-minded" and inserting "mentally retarded";

(B) by striking out "Board" and inserting "Department"; and

(C) by striking out "The District Training School" and inserting "Forest Haven".

(2) Section 2 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 32-603) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. For purposes of this Act, the term 'mentally retarded persons' means persons afflicted with mental defectiveness from birth or from an early age, so pronounced that they are incapable of managing themselves and their affairs, and who require supervision, control, and care for their own welfare, for the welfare of others, or for the welfare of the community, and who are not insane nor of unsound mind to such an extent as to require their commitment to a hospital for the mentally ill."

(3) Section 3 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 32-604) is amended—

(A) by striking out "Board" and inserting "Department";

(B) by striking out "inmates" and inserting "patients"; and

(C) by striking out "board" each place it appears and inserting "Department".

(4) Section 4 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 32-605) is amended—

(A) by striking out "Board" and inserting "Department";

(B) by striking out "feeble-minded" and inserting "mentally retarded"; and

(C) by striking out "board" and inserting "Department".

Sec. 2. (a) Chapter 11 of the District of Columbia Code (relating to commitment and maintenance of feeble-minded persons) is amended as follows:

(1) Such chapter is amended by striking out "feeble-minded" each place it appears in sections 21-1102 through 21-1108, 21-1110, 21-1111, 21-1113 through 21-1115, 21-1118, and 21-1123 and inserting in each such place in those sections "mentally retarded".

(2) Such chapter is amended by striking out "the District Training School" each place it appears in sections 21-1102, 21-1108 through 21-1113, 21-1116, and 21-1118 through 21-1122 and inserting in each such place in those sections "Forest Haven".

(3) (A) Such chapter is amended by inserting after section 21-1108 the following new section:

"§ 21-1108A. Voluntary admission to Forest Haven

"(a) The Director of Public Welfare (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Director') may admit to Forest Haven as a patient any adult who has been a resident of the District of Columbia for one year next preceding the date of application or any child under the age of twenty-one whose parents or legal guardian has been a resident of the District of Columbia for one year next preceding the date of application. A person may be admitted to Forest Haven as a patient under this section only if—

"(1) such person is certified by the Director of Public Health to be mentally retarded and in need of care at Forest Haven;

"(2) such person either by himself, his parents, his spouse, or his legal guardian makes written application for admission to Forest Haven; and

"(3) any contract required by subsection (d) has been executed.

"(b) Any person admitted to Forest Haven pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be released therefrom no later than five days after receipt by the Superintendent of Forest Haven of a written request for release, except that if within such five-day period a petition concerning such person, as provided by section 21-1103, is filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, such person shall be detained until a final judgment is entered by the court upon such petition.

(c) The Director may discharge any patient of Forest Haven admitted under this section if the Director is satisfied that such

discharge will not adversely affect the welfare or interests of the mentally retarded person, the community, or others.

"(d) (1) If the Director finds that any person with respect to whom an application for admission to Forest Haven has been made, as provided in this section, or any parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian of such person, is able to pay all or any part of the cost of maintenance and care of such person, the Director shall not admit such person unless a contract for payment, satisfactory to the Director is executed by such person, parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian.

"(2) The Director is authorized to enter into any agreement he deems necessary with any applicant to become a patient in Forest Haven, or with his parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian, for payment to the District of Columbia of all or part of the cost of such maintenance and care. Upon default of payment provided by any contract entered into under this section, the Director is authorized to discharge the patient of Forest Haven with respect to whose cost of maintenance and care the contract was entered into, and, in addition, he may utilize the procedures provided for in sections 21-1110 and 21-1111 to secure payment.

"(e) The Director, with the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(B) The table of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 21-1108 the following: "21-1108A. Voluntary admission to Forest Haven."

(4) Section 21-1101 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 21-1101. Definitions

"For purposes of this chapter—

"'Forest Haven' means the institution established pursuant to section 32-601, and designated 'Forest Haven' by section 32-602, or any successor to that institution;

"'mentally retarded person' means any person afflicted with mental defectiveness from birth or from an early age, so pronounced that he is incapable of managing himself and his affairs, and who requires supervision, control, and care for his own welfare, for the welfare of others, or for the welfare of the community, and who is not insane nor of unsound mind to such an extent as to require his commitment to a hospital for the mentally ill."

(5) The first sentence of section 21-1110 is amended by inserting immediately after "as a public patient" the following: "or when a person is admitted to Forest Haven as a patient under section 21-1108A."

(6) The first sentence of section 21-1111 is amended by striking out "and finds" and inserting "or when a person is admitted to Forest Haven as a patient under section 21-1108A, and the court finds".

(7) Section 21-1117 is amended by striking out "in feeble-mindedness" and inserting "initiated by a petition filed under section 21-1103".

(8) Section 21-1121 is amended by striking out "an inmate" and inserting "a patient".

(9) The section heading for section 21-1102 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "District Training School" and inserting "Forest Haven".

(10) The section heading for section 21-1103 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "feeble-mindedness" and inserting "mental retardation".

(11) The section heading for section 21-1108 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "District Training School" and inserting "Forest Haven".

(12) The section heading for section 21-

1114 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "feeble-minded" and inserting "mentally retarded".

(13) The section heading for section 21-1117 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "of feeble-minded cases" and inserting "of cases brought under section 21-1103".

(14) The section heading for section 21-1118 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "feeble-minded" and inserting "mentally retarded".

(15) The section heading for section 21-1121 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "inmates" and inserting "patients".

(16) The section heading for section 21-1122 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "inmates" and inserting "patients".

(17) The chapter heading for such chapter is amended by striking out "FEEBLE-MINDED" and inserting "MENTALLY RETARDED".

(b) The table of chapters for title 21 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out in the item relating to chapter 11 "FEEBLE-MINDED" and inserting "MENTALLY RETARDED".

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 3371, as amended, is to accomplish the following:

First. To authorize voluntary admission of mental patients to the District Training School, whose name is changed to Forest Haven.

Second. To require that a prerequisite to such voluntary admissions be a financial arrangement with the District of Columbia on behalf of such patients when they or their relatives are financially able to pay for all or a part of the expenses involved.

Third. Delete certain archaic terminology in the present law and substitute modern terminology in its place.

The technical amendments are necessary to conform to the law as codified and to clarify the same.

The District Training School—Forest Haven—is an institution at Laurel, Md., operated by the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare for mentally retarded citizens of the District, where such persons are not only cared for but are given such education and training as their mental capacities will permit.

Under present law, admission to the District Training School—Forest Haven—can be accomplished only by court order, the issuance of which must be preceded by a petition to the court and a hearing. It is the opinion of this committee that families could well be spared the emotional ordeal involved in bringing their mentally retarded relatives before the court, and that the time of the court could more profitably be used for other purposes. In this connection, we are in-

formed that these petitions are nearly always uncontested.

H.R. 3371 would provide, in addition to this present system of admission to the District Training School—Forest Haven—by court order, for voluntary admission in cases where the District of Columbia Director of Public Health determines that the applicant is eligible for admission, and where the patient expresses no objection to being admitted.

A patient voluntarily admitted would have the privilege of petitioning for his own release, and would be discharged 5 days after filing his petition with the Superintendent of the Training School, unless during this period the Director of Public Welfare petitions the district court to detain the patient for court hearing. In this event, the patient would be detained until the court has disposed of the case.

This bill provides further that where the term "District Training School" occurs in the present law, the more commonly used title "Forest Haven" shall be substituted. Similarly, the more humane term, "mentally retarded," would replace "feeble-minded," and the word "patient" would be inserted in lieu of "inmate." This committee feels that these changes in terminology would serve to a degree to spare the feelings of the families of these retarded persons and thus lighten the burden upon them.

At a public hearing conducted on July 26, 1963, the Administrator of the District of Columbia Children's Center, of which the District Training School—Forest Haven—is a part, testified that the Department uses a scale similar to the public assistance scale in determining what amount the families of patients admitted to the Training School should be required to pay. Such payment is then stipulated in the court order authorizing the admission. However, changes in the families' financial circumstances frequently occur during the patient's period of residence at the Training School, which may make them able to pay substantially more than was originally stipulated, or unable to pay as much. In either case, present law requires the Department of Public Welfare to go back into court for any change in the original agreement. The Department is very much in favor of the provision in H.R. 3371 which would authorize them to handle the financial arrangements with the families directly, as this would facilitate frequent review and adjustment of charges when altered circumstances indicate a need for such changes.

The District of Columbia Board of Commissioners requested this legislation, and approval has been expressed also by the Director of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health. No opposition to its enactment has been expressed.

The progenitor of this legislation is H.R. 7440 of the 88th Congress, which passed the House on August 26, 1963—House Report 704—and also H.R. 1700 of the 89th Congress, which was approved by the House on February 8, 1965—House Report 23. The following letter, which was written in 1963, expresses the District of Columbia Commissioners' approval of this proposed legislation:

APRIL 11, 1963.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended.

The main purposes of the bill are threefold: (1) To amend present law to provide for the voluntary admission of patients at the District Training School; (2) to provide that such voluntary admissions be subject to financial arrangements made with the District of Columbia on behalf of such patients when such patients or their relatives are financially able to reimburse the District in whole or in part for the expenses of such patients; and (3) to amend present law by striking certain archaic terms therein and inserting in lieu thereof modern terminology.

Under present law admission of a mentally retarded person to the District Training School may be accomplished only by means of a petition presented to the court followed by a hearing and the entry of a court order. This necessitates bringing before the court the mentally retarded person. It is a time-consuming and emotional ordeal to the persons involved. Notwithstanding that in each case the testimony of physicians is required, the petitions are uncontested in the vast majority of cases.

In addition to admission by court commitment, the bill also permits voluntary admission to the District Training School if the Director of Public Welfare first determines that the mentally retarded person is eligible for admission. Any patient who is voluntarily admitted may petition the Superintendent of the District Training School for his release. He would be entitled to be discharged not more than 5 days after filing with the Superintendent a written request for release, unless during such 5-day period the Director of Public Welfare filed in the district court a petition to detain the patient in the institution pending final court hearing on his case.

In connection with the voluntary admission of mentally retarded persons to the District Training School, the bill provides for payment to the District of Columbia of the full or partial cost of the board, medical care, and treatment of the voluntary patient, if the patient or person legally responsible for him is able to make such payment. The bill authorizes the Director of Public Welfare to enter into any agreement he deems necessary with an applicant for admission to the District Training School, or with his parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian for payment to the District of Columbia of all or part of the cost of such maintenance or care. The Director, with the approval of the Commissioners, may prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of the section of the bill authorizing such voluntary admissions.

In recognition of modern terminology in this field the bill also provides that wherever the terms "District Training School," "Board of Public Welfare," "feeble-minded" and "inmate" occur in such act that they are stricken, and the terms "Forest Haven," "Department of Public Welfare," "mentally-retarded," and "patient," respectively, are inserted in lieu thereof. The first two terms are obsolete in the sense that the District Training School has for sometime been referred to as Forest Haven and the Board of Public Welfare, pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952, has become the Department of Public Welfare. The last two stricken terms are archaic in the present concept of public welfare work, and the terms substituted in lieu of them accord with modern public welfare practice.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia earnestly recommend the enactment of the proposed bill for the following reasons:

1. It would avoid the emotional ordeal by parent and child now made necessary by court appearance.

2. It would save the time of the court, court personnel, medical witnesses, the Office of the Corporation Counsel, and the institution staff.

3. It would expedite admission of the applicant into the institution by providing for direct admission without court procedure.

4. It would facilitate discharge in appropriate cases by avoiding court procedures if and when the patient recovers sufficiently to be returned to the community.

5. It would result in substantial savings to the District of Columbia.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize voluntary admission of patients to the District of Columbia institution providing care, education, and treatment of mentally retarded persons."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT BAND

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 831) to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to authorize members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department band, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 831

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the establishment of a band in the Metropolitan Police force", approved July 11, 1947, is amended as follows:

(1) The second sentence of the first section of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4-182) is amended to read as follows: "The Commissioners are authorized in their discretion to detail officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the District of Columbia Fire Department to participate in the activities of such band."

(2) Such Act is amended by inserting immediately after the first section the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized in his discretion to detail officers and members of the United States Park Police force to participate in the activities of the band established by this Act, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized in his discretion to detail officers and members of the White House Police force to participate in the activities of such band."

(3) Section 5 of such Act is repealed and section 4 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4-184) (relating to an authorization of appropriations) is redesignated as section 5.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in May 1963, a Cumberland, Md., contractor by the name of William D. Goff became so incensed by press accounts of Adam Clayton Powell's frequent absences from House sessions that he brought suit against him in Federal district court in Washington.

Also named in the suit was the then Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY and House Sergeant at Arms Zeake Johnson.

The suit was based on title 2, United States Code, chapter 3, section 39, which provides that the Sergeant at Arms "shall deduct from the monthly payments of each Member or delegate the amount of his salary for each day that he has been absent, unless such Member or delegate assigns the reason for such absence the sickness of himself or of some member of his family."

Attorney General KENNEDY was sued to make him enforce the law. The Sergeant at Arms was named in the suit in order to compel him to collect any salary due the Government, and Powell obviously was sued to make him refund the money he owed due to unauthorized absences.

Summonses were issued for each defendant in June 1963, and both KENNEDY and Johnson were served immediately. Powell, curiously, or perhaps not so curiously, could not be found.

On June 18, 1963, the U.S. marshals reported Powell "out of the country." On July 31, the second time they tried to serve the summons, they reported he was "not available."

On September 4, after Goff complained to the court that the failure to locate Powell "is a patently ridiculous situation," the marshals reported that they had been "unable to contact personally."

On October 3, 1963, they reported they were "unable to contact after repeated attempts," and on October 24 they handed in an identical report.

Finally, some 6 weary months after the suit was filed, and only after Goff's lawyer threatened a contempt of court proceeding, did the marshalls find their man. And where did they find him on November 21, 1963? Right here in Washington, D.C., at 16 Gresham Court, Southeast.

It is most interesting to note that upon being served in the 1963 case, Powell went immediately to the Justice Depart-

ment and got no less than Assistant Attorney General John W. Douglas and two assistants to prepare his defense.

And what was the defense? That the Federal district court had no jurisdiction over the House of Representatives, nor over the then Representative Powell, because it "would be an unauthorized interference with the legislative function, in violation of the constitutional separation of powers."

As every Member of the House well knows, it was only a few days ago that Powell went into this same Federal district court in Washington, D.C., with a pleading that the court has the jurisdiction and authority to decide whether the recent House action excluding him from membership was illegal.

In 1963, the Constitution of the United States meant one thing to Adam Clayton Powell. In 1967, and without benefit of amendment, the Constitution has for Powell a diametrically opposite meaning.

Right here it might be well to ask where the Justice Department stands now? It would indeed be interesting to know.

In the 1963 case, the citizen and plaintiff, William Goff, confronted with the power and unlimited funds arrayed against him by the Justice Department, and having exhausted his personal funds available for the suit, was forced to abandon it and the case was dropped.

But we are entitled to speculate as to what would have happened had Goff won his legal action. Having defended Powell, how could the Justice Department have instituted any action necessary to collect the moneys owed to the Federal Government by Powell?

And when does the Justice Department intend to move in behalf of the citizens of this country to recover the moneys which Adam Clayton Powell owes the Federal Government? As long ago as last December, the House Administration Committee produced the evidence that Powell had illegally spent or converted to his own use thousands of dollars in Federal funds. The select committee of the House, established on January 10, subsequently confirmed this evidence and added to it. For what reason is the Justice Department dragging its feet?

If, as the two House committees have charged, Adam Clayton Powell flaunted the laws and converted Government funds to his personal use, he ought to be promptly hauled into court, fined and jailed for his peculations as any other citizen would be.

Or is it planned, as the House minority leader, Mr. Ford, suggested over the weekend, that in the event of Powell's election on April 11 he be seated in the House and fined \$40,000, the fine to be paid at the rate of \$1,000 per month by deduction from his paycheck? In other words, make the taxpayers pay back the money which Powell gouged out of them in the first place.

The jails and prisons of this country are full of culprits who would like to exchange their cells for a Government job and a deduction from their paychecks that would never repay that which they stole in the first place.

It would be difficult to dream up a more ridiculous formula for the punishment of an absconder, either in or out of Congress.

In all charity I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] and any others who may be interested, that the House spoke decisively on March 1 when it voted to exclude Powell from membership—not temporarily—but for the 90th Congress. That action has the approval of the vast majority of the citizens of this country and any attempt now to condition the public or Members of the House to the acceptance of crookedness and rascality is totally unacceptable.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 831 is to permit members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Park Police force to be detailed by the District of Columbia Commissioners, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Interior, respectively, to participate in the activities of the Metropolitan Police Department band.

This bill is identical to H.R. 8205 of the 89th Congress, as passed by the House on August 22, 1966 (H. Rept. 1818).

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Actually, some members of these other forces do participate as members of the Police Department band. However, since present law does not permit them to be officially detailed to this duty, they must do so without any coverage as to disability compensation which applies when such members are performing their official duties. In short, therefore, while members of all these forces may and do participate as members of the Police Department band, only members of the Metropolitan Police Department are presently protected against injury or disability incurred while engaged in the band's activities.

It is the opinion of your committee that all members of this band should be adequately protected against injury incurred while engaged in the band's activities. This bill will accomplish this by providing that members of all these forces, when assigned to the police band, will be engaged in official duty and hence will be eligible during such activity for the same disability benefits to which they are entitled when performing their regular duties.

Another present difficulty in connection with members of the Fire Department, White House Police, and the U.S. Park Police participating as members of the Police Department band is that they must do so on their own time, whereas the time spent by Police Department members of the band in rehearsals and performances counts as part of their regular workweek. Further, if such time is spent outside their regular duty hours, then the Police Department members are entitled to an equal amount of compensatory time off. The provisions of this bill will extend this arrangement also to members of these other forces who participate in the band's activities, so that the time so spent by all members of the band will be considered as part of their duty hours.

It is the view of your committee that these provisions will have the desirable effect of materially increasing the size of this fine Police Department band.

BACKGROUND

The Metropolitan Police Department band was first officially authorized by an act of Congress in 1947, as "a band to perform at such municipal or civic functions and events as may be authorized by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

The members participate in this band without extra compensation, though a director is authorized at a salary not to exceed that of a captain in the Metropolitan Police Department.

The Metropolitan Police Department band presently consists of 20 regularly participating members. By calling upon other musicians in the White House Police force, the U.S. Park Police force, and the Metropolitan Police force, it is possible to organize a unit of approximately 50 pieces.

ROLE OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT BAND

At a public hearing on this legislation conducted on August 1, 1966, your committee was informed that the mission of the Police Department band is far broader in scope than merely playing at parades, ceremonies, and dedications for whatever public relations value these may have. While the band does strive, of course, to make a good showing in such highly competitive performances as American Legion parades and Shriners parades, of far greater importance to the Police Department, and to the District, is the band's contribution in the fields of community relations, cadet recruiting, crime deterrence, and bringing the true image of the policeman before the District of Columbia citizen of tomorrow.

This portion of the Police Department band's mission is made possible by an arrangement with the District of Columbia Superintendent of Schools, by which this police band joins with the various high school bands in the city for special assembly programs. Each of these programs requires two 1-hour rehearsals. During these rehearsals and the assembly program itself, the seating arrangement is such that a police musician sits in a group of high school musicians, all playing the same type instrument. Through this experience of common interest and participation in music, the children and the policemen discover a mutual appreciation and understanding of each other, which the Police Department has found to be invaluable to all concerned. These children will be less hesitant and reluctant to call on their new friend, the police bandsman, and their parents will also be more apt to regard the policeman in the light of friendship.

The point is eloquently expressed in a letter addressed to D.C. Police Chief John B. Layton from the principal of one of the senior high schools in the District. This letter was submitted to your committee in testimony, and states in part as follows:

DEAR CHIEF LAYTON: On Thursday, February 11, it was our pleasure to have the Police Band perform for our student body at an

assembly. The students and faculty were quite impressed. It is my belief that this was an excellent bit of public relations. You are to be commended for encouraging and maintaining this group. It is an image of the Police Department we need to encourage just as well as the law enforcement side of the Department. In closing, I would like to again commend you for maintaining and promoting this worthwhile group.

The Metropolitan Police Department band offers opportunities also to members of these forces with no previous musical training to come into its program. For example, the present director has organized a group of D.C. police cadets, most of whom had no previous knowledge of music whatever, into a group of drummers. Also, he offers private lessons free of charge to any member of the various forces who wishes to learn to play an instrument.

CONCLUSIONS

Your committee is of the opinion that this Police Department band represents a useful weapon in the war against crime in the District of Columbia. Further, we believe that its service in this respect has not been utilized to its fullest extent. Your committee suggests, for example, that this band, as it will expand under the provisions of this bill, might well be sent outside the District of Columbia to perform as an aid to the recruitment program. Such a demonstration to the public that the Metropolitan Police Department offers opportunities for outlets other than just police work could prove a valuable asset, indeed, to recruitment.

The committee recommends this proposed legislation, therefore, to augment the important contribution which this band is making toward alleviating crime in the District of Columbia, and urges that its use be expanded as far as is practicable.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONERS' LETTER

The following is the letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, recommending this legislation:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,

Washington, D.C., February 24, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington D.C.

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report H.R. 831, 90th Congress, a bill "To amend the Act of July 11, 1947, to authorize members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department Band, and for other purposes."

The purpose of this bill is to allow members of the District of Columbia Fire Department and United States Park Police and White House Police to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department Band. While members of the District of Columbia Fire Department presently participate in the activities of the Metropolitan Police Department Band, they do so without coverage of the disability provisions of law which apply when performing official duties. Under the terms of the bill, firemen and United States Park Police and White House Police, when assigned to the Police Band, would be engaged in official duty and would continue to

be eligible for disability benefits to which they are entitled when performing their regular duties.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia recommend enactment of the bill. The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,

President, Board of Commissioners, D.C.

An example of the benefits from this band is shown in a newspaper clipping over the past weekend:

POLICE WIELD BATON AT STUDENT CONCERT

(By Alfred E. Lewis)

The Metropolitan Police Department threw the sound of music yesterday into its effort to convince Washington high school students that policemen are on their side.

It was the inaugural program of what Police Chief John B. Layton and the D.C. Board of Education call the Side by Side phase of the Department's community relations drive.

For 1½ hours, some 450 Anacostia High School students and school, police and civic officials were treated to a musical program by the Metropolitan Police Band and the Anacostia High School Band.

There was also an operatic selection, sung by William Dupree, of the New York Civic Opera Co., and composer James L. Dixon sang his "The District of Columbia Is My Home Town."

The program also featured the world premiere of a police theme song, "Stand Tall," with lyrics by Army Lt. Col. Vernden McQueen, now serving in Vietnam, a snatch of which goes, "Stand tall for everyone you meet/Walk proud along your daily beat/Sing out and tell them all/That the men wearing blue stand tall."

Eleventh Precinct Capt. Owen Davis gave a student-civic achievement award to the school's Cadet Corps Capt. Wayne E. Wigham, an Anacostia track star and Student Council leader.

Assistant School Supt. John D. Koontz brought down the house with his introduction of Police Pvt. Pete Barrack, Anacostia's schoolboy patrol coordinator, and an Anacostia graduate himself.

"If the number of boys he has kept from going wrong," Koontz said, "were laid end to end, they'd stretch from here to Lorton."

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

EXEMPTIONS FROM ATTACHMENT AND CERTAIN OTHER PROCESS IN THE CASE OF PERSONS NOT RESIDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 836) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 836

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1107 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 15-403), is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by

inserting immediately after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the wages (as defined in section 1104 A(f) of this Act) of any person not residing in the District of Columbia who does not earn the major portion of such wages in the District of Columbia shall, in any case arising out of a contract or transaction entered into outside of the District of Columbia, be exempt from attachment, levy, or seizure, by any process or proceeding of any court, judge, or officer of the District of Columbia in the same amount and to the same extent as is provided by the law of the State in which such person resides for persons residing therein. Whenever any claim is made for an exemption from attachment pursuant to this subsection, the burden shall be upon the plaintiff to prove that the contract or transaction involved in the case was entered into within the District of Columbia."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend section 15-503 of the District of Columbia Code with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 through 5 and insert the following: "That section 15-503 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by"

Page 1, line 10, strike out "section 1104A(f) of this Act" and insert "section 16-571 of the District of Columbia Code".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill (H.R. 836) is to stop a practice which has developed in relation to the use of garnishment laws in a way which enables a creditor to do indirectly what he is not permitted to do directly in his own jurisdiction.

This practice involves the filing in the District of Columbia of an action for garnishment against an employer who also has a business in Maryland, so as to secure payment by attachment of wages from an employee who is not a resident of the District. The object of such practice is to escape the limitations in States outside the District, regarding exemptions from garnishment in favor of employees. This bill is designed to assure that where an action in such a case is brought in the District of Columbia, the nonresident defendant involved will be entitled to the same exemptions as are provided by law in the State in which the said defendant may reside.

Maryland law, for example, provides for an exemption from attachment of wages and salaries in the amount of \$100 for each pay period. In a month, or 4½ weeks, this exemption would aggregate \$433. Your committee has been informed that some persons in the debt collection business have found that the District of Columbia garnishment law provides a lower exemption; namely, 90 percent of the first \$200 per month of wages, 80 percent of the next \$300 per month, and 50 percent of all above \$500 per month. In the case of a worker earning a wage of \$100 per week, or \$433 per month, therefore, an employee's entire salary would be exempt from attachment in Maryland, but in the District of Columbia only \$366.40 per month would be

exempt, leaving \$66.60 per month subject to garnishment.

Accordingly, your committee, in hearings, was advised that Baltimore creditors, with claims against employees living and working in Baltimore, have in several instances determined that the employers also have places of business in the District of Columbia and hence are subject to service of garnishment or attachment process in the District, and accordingly have brought their claims to Washington and filed suits here, laying an attachment against the wages of the employee debtor in the hands of the employer, thus escaping the exemption from attachment provided by Maryland laws.

This same procedure could conceivably be adopted by collection agencies from any State if the employer maintains a place of business in the District, so that he would be subject to the service of garnishment process here.

This committee is of the opinion that it was never intended that District of Columbia law should serve as a collection medium against employees who live elsewhere, work elsewhere, and may even never have been in the District of Columbia. This bill is intended to so amend the District of Columbia law as to terminate this practice by granting to nonresidents of the District the exemptions from garnishment and attachment of wages afforded by their local State laws.

With the exception of technical amendments, this bill is identical to H.R. 7882 of the 88th Congress, which was amended to meet suggestions made by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and which passed the House on October 14, 1963—House Report 836—and also to H.R. 1007 of the 89th Congress, which was approved by the House on February 8, 1965—House Report 25.

The reason for these several technical amendments is that the provisions of law amended by the bill have been codified into positive law, necessitating several changes in reference.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 15-503 of the District of Columbia Code with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUIRE REPORTS OF MOTOR VEHICLE COLLISIONS TO METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 1437) to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1437

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (43 Stat. 1124; sec. 40-609(a), D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended (a) by adding at the end of the first paragraph the following: "In addition to the preceding requirements with respect to the action to be taken immediately in cases involving personal injury or substantial damage to property, every person who, in the District of Columbia, operates a motor vehicle which is involved in a collision, which has resulted in damage to the property of any one person in excess of \$100 or in bodily injury to or in the death of any person, shall immediately make a written report thereof to the Chief of Police, on a form prescribed by him. Such written report shall be made without regard to the degree of personal injury resulting from such collision. In the event the operator of a motor vehicle involved in a collision is injured or otherwise disabled to such an extent as to render him incapable, in the opinion of his attending physician, of making any report of the collision as required by this subsection, such operator shall make such report within forty-eight hours after the date on which, in the opinion of his attending physician, he can reasonably be expected to have recovered from his injury or other disability to the extent of being able to prepare and submit the required report."; and (b) by striking "substantial" in the third paragraph.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Commissioners by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (68 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Commissioners may be delegated by said Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill (H.R. 1437) is to require that all collisions involving motor vehicles in the District of Columbia which result in property damage in excess of \$100, or in personal injury of any degree, be reported immediately to the District of Columbia Chief of Police.

Under present law, motor vehicle collisions as described above must be reported within 5 days to the safety responsibility officer of the District of Columbia, who functions as a part of the Department of Motor Vehicles and whose primary responsibility is to determine the financial responsibility of the various parties to such accidents. However, only those collisions which result in personal injury are required to be reported to the Chief of Police. Although the Police Department is required to forward copies of all their accident reports to the safety responsibility officer, the latter does not send his reports to the Police Department.

Your committee is informed that during fiscal year 1964, while 37,691 motor vehicle collisions were reported to the safety responsibility officer, only 29,345 were reported to the Chief of Police. Thus, during this year 8,346 motor vehicle accidents involving property damage in excess of \$100 were never reported to the police.

A change in the recordkeeping policies of the Safety Responsibility Division of the Department of Motor Vehicles makes it impossible to obtain more recent statistics on this situation. Your committee is reliably informed, however, that the problem has not improved since 1964.

Two glaring weaknesses are inherent in this situation. First, whereas copies of all the Police Department's reports are sent to the Bureau of Traffic Engineering and Operations of the District of Columbia Highway Department, where they serve to reveal dangerous areas in the city's street system and thus guide the Highway Department in effecting corrective measures, the safety responsibility officer's reports are not adaptable for this purpose and hence are not sent to the Bureau of Traffic Engineering. Thus, the facts involved in 8,346 serious collisions were not made available to the Highway Department for this very valuable purpose during fiscal year 1964.

The second major point of weakness which H.R. 1437 seeks to correct is the matter of the chronic offenders among the drivers involved in the 9,000 collisions per year of which the police are not apprised. When any driver becomes involved in accidents with sufficient frequency to cause suspicion as to his fitness to operate a motor vehicle, the safety responsibility officer reports the case to the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles, who orders a hearing to determine the person's fitness status, both physical and with respect to attitude. An adverse finding as a result of this hearing brings about a suspension or revocation of the offender's permit to drive. However, the safety responsibility officer and the Department of Motor Vehicles do not and cannot act in any way to initiate legal prosecution against any such offender, for this is a police function. Is it obvious that a chronically negligent driver, utterly lacking in a normal sense of responsibility, may become involved in frequent motor vehicle collisions and thus become a real hazard to the public; and while suspension or revocation of the operator's permit may be effective in some such cases, certainly in many others nothing short of legal prosecution can provide the protection to which the public is entitled.

H.R. 1437, therefore, is designed to bring about a degree of accident control and traffic safety which is not possible under existing law.

Bills identical to H.R. 1437 have been passed by the House in the past three Congresses. The latest was H.R. 947 of the 89th Congress, approved by the House on February 8, 1965—House Report 18.

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

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the District of Columbia Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS CALLED UPON TO REPUDIATE THE POSITION OF DR. RALPH BUNCHE ON ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I returned to my district on March 2, on a committee trip not financed, by the way, at Government expense, I was appalled and infuriated to learn that an official of the U.N. had, on that day in Dallas, excoriated the Congress of the United States for its action in the matter of Adam Clayton Powell.

This man, Dr. Ralph Bunche, stated, and I quote, that he was "shocked by the extreme action taken," and called it "subverting the democratic process."

He further stated, and I quote:

Emotion, prejudice and hypocrisy ran deeply in the action of the House on Wednesday, and that if Powell were white, he would have his seat today.

It is true that he said he was speaking in a personal capacity, but he should have had the intelligence to know that no one in such an official capacity could disassociate himself from his official position and speak as an individual citizen.

Whether he intended so or not, his remarks implied an official position of the United Nations.

In view of this, I call upon the Secretary General of the U.N. to publicly and officially repudiate the position taken by its Under Secretary and further charge the Secretary General that if he fails to take this action, he will be giving tacit approval to this unwarranted meddling in the internal affairs of a member nation by the U.N.

I am inserting, at this point in the RECORD, the full text of the interview of Dr. Bunche with Miss Carolyn Barta of the Dallas Morning News:

**BUNCHE BLASTS CONGRESS OVER POWELL'S
EXPULSION**

(By Carolyn Barta)

International diplomat and Nobel Peace prizewinner Dr. Ralph Bunche rebuked the U.S. Congress Thursday for expelling New York Rep. Adam Clayton Powell.

But the United Nations under-secretary specified in a Dallas press conference that he was speaking exclusively in his personal capacity as an American citizen and not as an official of the U.N. secretariat.

The Negro leader said he was "shocked by the extreme nature of the action taken" and called it "subverting the democratic process."

"The expulsion is punitive not only against Adam Powell but against the overwhelming majority of voters in his Harlem district who have elected him, since it deprives them of the voice and the vote in the House of Representatives to which, by the Constitution, they have the right," he said.

Bunche conceded that Powell's conduct "often has been reprehensible and deplorable," and that he would not vote for the Harlem representative if he lived in that district.

"But his constituents elect him time after time," the Negro leader said, predicting that they will now elect him again by a larger margin than ever before.

"This is their right and this, in fact, is Adam's strength. The House, therefore, finds itself in the anomalous position of defying the clearly expressed and free will of the voters of Harlem."

Bunche said he felt that "emotion, preju-

dice and hypocrisy ran deeply in the action of the House on Wednesday" and that if Powell were white, he would have his seat today.

The under-secretary also touched on issues of interest to the U.N. during the interview in the American Airlines Celebrity Room at Love Field.

On Viet Nam, Bunche said that "undoubtedly some impact is being made from pressure on both sides to end this conflict." But he added that there is no indication of a breakthrough.

Secretary-General U Thant is making proposals to both sides—some announced and some not, Bunche said, adding that U Thant's opinion is that the only way to get to the conference table is to stop the bombing in Vietnam.

The U.N. official, who works directly under the secretary-general as Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs, said that U Thant is strictly on vacation this week in Burma.

Bunche announced his retirement from the United Nations a month ago, but said here Thursday that he had changed his mind.

He was in Dallas to speak Thursday night at the spring program of a lecture series sponsored by the Brotherhood of Temple Emanu-El.

MAN OF LA MANCHA

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend a performance of the play "Man of La Mancha" at the National Theater recently. I found the play engaging, and a delight to watch. "Man of La Mancha" presented an inspirational rather than a derogatory view of man's life on this earth. Unlike so many of the plays that are popular today, "Man of La Mancha" inspired in the audience a warm, lifting feeling, and left it with the thought that man's goals and aspirations are worthwhile and important.

Mr. Richard L. Coe, the distinguished drama critic of the Washington Post has written an excellent account of the "affirmative" nature of "Man of La Mancha." I place his article of March 5, 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

**AFFIRMATION IS THE QUEST OF 'MAN OF THE
LA MANCHA'**

(By Richard L. Coe)

While the intellectual critical cabala continues to moan about the outrageous indignities of being human, a very heartening thing has been happening.

This is the enormous public acceptance of "Man of La Mancha," which is at the National for another two weeks while the New York production continues to lure theatergoers to remote Washington Square.

"The Theater of the Absurd," "The Theater of Cruelty" and "The Theater of Insanity" are favored topics of the ivory tower set whose writings become primary sources for theatrical history and contemporary honors. These same voices lament the decline of the theater and the obtuseness of the public.

Thus, "Man of La Mancha" shouts yes to life, recognizing the harsh realities but reclaiming the fashionable negatives.

"Man of La Mancha," besides being creatively imaginative, is above all an affirmation.

Yes, the setting is a jail, the central character veers on madness, subsidiary figures include thieves and rapists and the principal girl is a self loathing harlot.

But through this glowing work runs something diametrically opposed to prevailing conclusions about life as a slimy gutter. In Joe Darion's lyrics and to Mich Leigh's ascending melody, the title character sings:

"To dream the impossible dream,
To fight the unbeatable foe,
To bear with unbearable sorrow,
To run where the brave dare not go . . .
To reach the unreachable star,
Though you know it's impossible high,
To live with your heart striving upward
To a far, unattainable sky!"

To me it is positively astounding that people can seriously discuss the plight of today's narrowed theater without taking into account the relation of philosophy and audience. Yet, you don't find any of the "serious" critics taking "Man of La Mancha" seriously.

Because it's "only a musical," Dale Wasserman's richly resourceful script is never mentioned in the same breath with Edward Albee, John Osborn, Peter Weiss, Beckett, Genet, Sartre or the one-shot shockers which dub their authors as "white hopes."

And "only a musical"! What nonsense is this? Teyve, of "Fiddler on the Roof," also has his impossible dream. What is more philosophical than "Mamie's" cry: "Life is a banquet and most poor sons-of-guns are starving to death!" Dolly Levi, musicalized from Thornton Wilder's "The Matchmaker," preaches that "money is like manure. For things to grow it has to be spread around."

Quite apart from the ingenuity with which these most popular works of our decade have been staged and the zest with which they are acted, these affirmative notions are just as philosophical as conclusions that life is a stacked deck.

This is where the masses are infinitely smarter than the deep thinkers. The mass of people have every reason to suspect that the cards are stacked, the dice loaded. From ivory tower comfort this is viewed as shuddery news.

What people wish to find in the plays and films they attend are reasons for living. Why should they spend time, money or enthusiasm to be told they are better off dead?

Of course, this does not mean that happy endings, pink miasmas, "sheer entertainment" or escapism are the only fields for drama or that tragedy is too stark for comfort.

"West Side Story" was certainly tragic. "It stemmed from 'Romeo and Juliet' and Shakespeare took that from French and Italian sources. Oedipus murdered his father and married his mother but the drama's effectiveness lies in his growing awareness of forces outside himself, not in his introspection. The meaning of tragedy does not stick in a character's inward gropings but breathes in his relationship to life outside himself.

Thus, the triumph of Wasserman's gradually evolved musical play lies in the relationship of Cervantes to his ultimate brainchild, Don Quixote. What little is known of Cervantes' life (he died within ten days of Shakespeare's death) indicates failure, harassments and poverty. His final gesture was to characterize the illusion, the quest, the impossible dream, as Wasserman calls it, and it was this which brought immortality.

So, "Man of La Mancha" tells both stories. With imaginative power which took the patience of some years to achieve, Wasserman places Cervantes in one of the Inquisition jails he occupied so frequently. There he tells of Don Quixote, this imaginary character who sees beyond the obvious to discover reasons for zestful living.

The concept, which grew from a 90-minute TV special, embraces some of the most vital

facets of contemporary theater. The thrust stage, which on tour can only be approximated, gathers audience into play. The shifting backwards and forwards in time (so eloquently vital to the works of Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams) are precise enough to avoid confusions. The break from realistic settings, the use of characters to embody other characters, even placing the orchestra on stage are as contemporary as the most ardent avantgardist could dream. The dancing is the finest Jack Cole has created for the musical stage and the whole has been realized with uncommon imagination by director Albert Marre.

Though he is the official star, Jose Ferrer takes the unstarlike view that this for him is never a vehicle. Because he recognized the work as a whole, he fought for the opportunity to play an extraordinarily demanding role. There are any number of good major roles and as Aldonza, Maura K. Wedge is magnificently stirring.

Yes, the details are as satisfying as Mitch Leigh's melodic, never-trite score but the root of this work's triumph lies in its philosophy, its belief in the glowing wonder of man, its defiant contempt for negation.

Those who bemoan the theater's dwindling audiences on a diet of nihilist philosophy may be too self-involved to grasp the obvious: that for affirmation there is widespread hunger.

SUBSTITUTE FOR CIA COVERT SUPPORT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1967, I introduced in the House H.R. 6990 which seeks to provide an open and publicly financed substitute for CIA covert support of student, labor, and teacher activities abroad whose cover was recently rudely removed and whose operation was subjected to embarrassing international scrutiny.

Incidentally, the removal of this assignment is one which the CIA will welcome with relief, I am sure.

I was pleased to read in yesterday's New York Times an editorial which describes perfectly the bill which I introduced. In particular, does it delineate the error in the past practice which it describes as "tainting with the secret funds of an espionage agency a wide variety of legitimate activities that should have been financed openly through private and public grants?"

Both because of its general pertinence and its relation to the legislation which I have introduced, I reproduce this editorial herewith.

I do point out, however, that the British council which is referred to in the editorial is exclusively a cultural organization and has no connection whatsoever with intelligence or propaganda.

The editorial follows:

DISPLACING CIA SUBSIDIES

Students have been making more sense than many of their elders in the controversy over Central Intelligence Agency subsidies to private organizations. The latest case in point is the proposal of the Collegiate Council of the United Nations that Congress create

an independent agency to continue—openly rather than covertly—financial aid to those of the C.I.A.-supported activities that remain needed despite the easing of the cold war.

Some of the C.I.A.-financed activities probably should never have been undertaken and others have been long outmoded. But the critical error in the C.I.A. program has been in tainting with the secret funds of an espionage agency a wide variety of legitimate activities that should have been financed openly through private and public grants.

Some useful activities—such as student and trade union participation in international forums—may be liquidated unless a way is now found to provide open financing. Other activities, still undisclosed, may continue to receive C.I.A. funds. Recent statements indicate that some C.I.A. officials and their Congressional apologists, like the Bourbon kings, have "learned nothing and forgotten nothing."

The worldwide ideological competition between Communism and democracy undoubtedly will continue for a long time, even if East-West political warfare gradually diminishes in volume and virulence. The role the United States needs to play in it—now that governments in Europe and others elsewhere are strong enough to defend their own societies against subversion—requires thorough reappraisal.

But two things are clear. The fact that Communist governments employ intelligence operatives for such purposes abroad does not mean that the United States must utilize the same device in getting a hearing for American views. Secondly, there is not now and never has been any justification for the C.I.A. to penetrate, influence and secretly subsidize American private organizations.

An essential step in unraveling the current mess is to transfer to a public agency the responsibility for helping private American organizations finance valuable international activities that cannot be financed privately.

An agency drawn up along the lines of the National Endowment of the Arts or the British Council—with distinguished private citizens as well as Government officials on the board—could both protect the national interest and avoid any suspicion that American private organizations are being subverted. The report of President Johnson's special study committee on the C.I.A. should contain a detailed project of this kind for submission to Congress.

FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 6, I introduced H.R. 6637, the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967.

This proposed Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967 would amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a comprehensive fire research and safety program to gather comprehensive fire data, conduct intensive fire research, educate and train in fire protection and safety and support demonstrations of improved and experimental fire protection and safety.

The best estimates available indicate that in 1965, fire in the United States caused 12,100 deaths and property damage amounting to \$1,741,300,000—\$8.98

for every man, woman, and child. Our per capita fire death rate is twice Canada's rate, four times the rate for the United Kingdom, and six and one-half times the rate for Japan. While our much higher per capita death rate may reflect the hazards that accompany our higher standard of living, this merely indicates that we must put forth greater fire safety efforts as our living standards rise, if we are to eliminate excessive loss of life to fire.

Over the past 5 years, the best privately estimated per capita fire death rate from all causes has remained relatively constant—although U.S. Public Health Service figures for nontransportation fires have increased 9 percent. Over the same period the estimated per capita number of fires in the United States has increased 9 percent and the estimated per capita property damage has increased 4 percent. Our 1965 estimated per capita property damage contrasts with \$6.85 for Canada, the next highest per capita loss among major countries. Japan, with a population of about one-half that of the United States, has a per capita loss of only \$1.32 and its total number of fires in 1965 is about one-fortieth of the number that occurred in the United States.

The ravages of uncontrolled fires have dotted the pages of history from its beginning. Great fires that are well known go back at least to Nero's Rome in the middle of the first century. King John promulgated building ordinances to prevent the spread of fire between buildings after the London fire of 1212—3 years before the Magna Carta. Research and testing of building constructions for fire resistance in this country started early in the last century but remained at a very low level until the great fires in Chicago, Baltimore, and San Francisco, the last two in the first decade of this century. The resulting impetus to fire studies has led to a more systematic approach and to the present collection of standard test methods.

At about the same time that fire testing and research was beginning to grow, the gathering of fire information and attempts at public education on fire safety took on a new stature. The National Fire Protection Association, founded in 1896, is the chief source for educational materials and consolidated fire information.

ROLE OF FIRE IN PUBLIC SAFETY

Fire strikes at man both physically and economically. There is no place or time when he may safely relax his guard. His homes, places of amusement, cities, transportation, and national resources are all vulnerable to fire. Fires start from natural causes such as lightning, but most causes are related to man's carelessness among the hazardous surroundings he has made for himself.

Fires in homes and apartments take many lives every year. Tragedies strike in places of public assembly despite laws and recommendations on construction, decoration, occupancy, and means of egress. Large losses of life have occurred in just the past few years as a result of fires in schools, hospitals, hotels, and restaurants. The recent tragedy in

a penthouse restaurant in Montgomery, Alabama, took 25 lives.

Without the significant efforts of private and public organizations in the field of fire safety, the record would be much worse. However, this record can and should be improved. Greater support of fire safety programs will be needed, if such improvement is to be achieved. The Federal Government should provide needed support through a national fire safety program, including direct financial support of activities of private nonprofit and public organizations, and increased Federal activities to provide technical support for their programs. The national program should encourage local initiative by supporting improved methods and techniques for preventing and controlling fires, reducing personal injury and property damage, or improving the efficiency, operation, or organization of the fire services.

Comprehensive and detailed information on fire causes and effects is essential to the best use of available resources to minimize the harm from fires. These resources must be directed to the most significant areas of the overall problem, which are only partially identified at present. For example, present fire cause data are not detailed enough to permit analysis to determine where research and other activities will be most beneficial. Similarly, education in fire safety and protection is hindered by a lack of detailed information on the nature and scope of the problem.

INFORMATION

Our present national efforts to gather information on fire causes and effects are carried on by private organizations. These organizations depend on voluntary cooperation of their members and others who are interested enough to provide reports. The National Fire Protection Association is generally recognized as having the best compilation of data on fire causes and losses of life and property. Despite diligent effort on the association's part, however, it receives statewide loss data from only about half of the States, and data on causes from about one-third of the States. The present NFPA budget, derived from members' dues plus the sale of publications cannot support staff operations in the field to gather directly the data which is not supplied to the association. Nor can the association appeal to any incentive for cooperation in the data gathering other than a common interest in fire safety.

Another group gathering data is the insurance industry. However, their primary interest is in the area of establishing insurance rates, and their data, and analyses thereof, are of appropriately limited scope.

We need more fire information than voluntary efforts have been able to gather. The proposed legislation would authorize Federal support that could be used to increase that level of effort significantly. Voluntary and uniform reporting of fire information could be achieved by grants to local organizations. The information gathering program would utilize a standardized reporting system, and one or more teams

of experts to investigate selected fires in depth and evaluate and improve the reporting system. There would also be a clearinghouse service for fire information, which would maintain a comprehensive library, provide materials and an abstract service, publish bibliographies and maintain rosters of those having highly specialized expertise.

The information gathered under this program would aid in planning, research, and in providing fire safety education. The clearinghouse service would furnish useful fire information to the fire service and others interested in fire safety throughout the country.

RESEARCH

The present research effort is carried on by fire equipment and building materials industries, trade associations, universities, nonprofit organizations, commercial laboratories, and Government agencies. The industry and trade association research, for the most part, is of an applied, product-oriented nature. Individual companies conduct little basic research. Industry has made use of trade associations as a mechanism for industrywide support of research on common problems. But this work also is predominantly applied research. Industry tends to look to those who are not profit motivated for the basic research information.

The Federal Government's funding for fire research program is about \$6 million concentrated mainly in the Forest Service and Department of Defense, the latter including the Office of Civil Defense. Smaller amounts go to the National Bureau of Standards, National Science Foundation, Bureau of Mines, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The research of the Government agencies is largely mission oriented, and not applicable to many common fire safety problems.

The primary deficiency of these research programs is that inadequate attention is given to establishing an understanding of the basic nature and behavior of fire upon which could be based a theory and more efficient practice of fire prevention and control. Instead, great reliance is placed on the less efficient method of empirical fire testing, to determine the fire resistance of various materials. The number of samples of building materials and assemblies that can be fire tested is limited because of cost, thus restricting technological innovation in the building industry.

A major research gap is in the area of fire department operations. The need for research here is becoming critical. Increasing costs of operating community services, the trend to great agglomeration of communities into metropolitan regions, and the rapid social and technological change are imposing demands on fire services for greater efficiency. In rural areas, the longer distances and uncertain water supplies, plus the hazard of large quantities of stored combustible agricultural products on many farms, place great demands on local fire services.

The legislation will authorize additional research nearly equal to the present Federal level immediately, much

of which will be used, through contracts, to support fundamental studies in the universities and other non-Federal facilities. There would also be development of improved methods and techniques for preventing and controlling fires, and for rehabilitating injured persons and damaged property.

EDUCATION

The National Fire Protection Association, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and the National Safety Council each has a national program in fire prevention education. Of these, NFPA's is the largest and includes Spring Clean-Up Week and Fire Prevention Week in October. Government and local public education programs are generally related to the national programs and make use of their educational literature.

Despite these efforts at public education, many members of the public are complacent and do not take the precautions needed to reduce the occurrences of fires caused by carelessness. Inadequate financial resources now preclude existing programs from fully effective use of mass communication media and of other public educational activities. The legislation would authorize grants to State and local fire service groups and support to national fire education groups for public fire safety education. It will also authorize Federal technical support of such educational activities.

Insufficient attention is given to fire prevention education in our institutions of higher learning. Engineering, architecture, city planning, and comparable curriculums should include fire problems and design approaches that will minimize fire occurrence and spread. Such design should become an integral part of the overall practice of those professions. Specialized training in the scientific and engineering aspects of fire protection are also needed. Only two universities offer 4-year curriculums leading to degrees in fire protection engineering. The proposed legislation would authorize grants for the development of curriculums and course material to facilitate the establishment of fire protection curriculums in additional colleges or universities, and facilitate the introduction of fire protection courses in other curriculums.

Most professional fire personnel lack sufficient training in command and control of disaster operations and in the control of special hazards. Education and training is essential to attainment of the highest levels of competence for the fire services. Many States have fire service schools offering short courses. However, the content and amount of training varies from State to State, and even within States since individual participation in some cases is dependent on the availability of local funds. The proposed legislation would authorize grants and support of the development of and participation in professional extension courses for fire service personnel and officers. We believe the objective should be the establishment of a program of periodic professional training for all fire services personnel, and for the staff of State fire marshals offices or other offices whose responsibilities have signifi-

cant relationship to fire. Such increased education should enhance professional stature and encourage career and executive development in the fire services, thereby attracting greater numbers of highly qualified individuals to this important area of public service.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Many interested firemen and other public spirited individuals have applied themselves to problems of public education, fire safety, and fire department operations. Frequently, these individuals have not been able to support, or find support for, practical demonstrations of the feasibility of improved training aids, operational procedures, public education programs, or other fire safety methods and techniques. Ideas for useful demonstration will also result from Federal fire safety activities. The proposed legislation would authorize Federal support of appropriate demonstrations, and thus would encourage local and individual initiative in the solution of fire safety problems.

NATIONAL FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY CENTER

This proposed legislation would state the sense of Congress that the Secretary should establish a fire research and safety center. While much of the research under this program will be performed outside the Federal Government or in other Federal facilities, neither private nor Government facilities in this country are equipped for certain kinds of research, such as growth and spread of fires within full-scale, multistory buildings or the interactions among structural elements under fire conditions. The results of these and similar studies could lead to advanced design practices reducing the likelihood and spread of fires. Consequently an advanced research center is needed for performance of such fundamental studies.

Additionally, the center would provide a central focus for management of the national fire safety program under this proposed legislation. By establishing close contact with research personnel, the center would facilitate development of necessary staff competence for both technical support of non-Federal activities and scientific management of contracts and grants.

Finally, the program also would utilize fully existing competence and facilities of other Federal agencies, and would be coordinated carefully with related existing Federal programs.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 20th anniversary of one of the most important and significant messages ever delivered to a joint session of Congress—the Truman doctrine.

When President Harry S. Truman spoke before Congress on March 12,

1947, two small but essential countries—Greece and Turkey—were endangered by communism.

With typical candor and courage, he warned that:

Should we fail to aid Greece and Turkey, the effect will be far-reaching to the West as well as to the East. We must take immediate and resolute action.

Congress did take such action and provided Greece and Turkey with \$400 million in military and economic aid during the 1948 fiscal year. This vital assistance saved these valiant, but weakened nations from the tyranny of communism.

Harry S. Truman was responsible for more momentous decisions than perhaps any President and later that year—1947—urged the Marshall plan, which helped to rebuild Europe's war-torn economy.

But when he asked for aid to Greece and Turkey, he produced a notable and dramatic change in American foreign policy—from 150 years of peacetime isolation, to involvement in serious European problems that affected free countries. It was this bold, but effective change, that resulted in our policy of containment of communism.

President Truman's foresight, courage, and strong leadership, not only saved Greece and Turkey from communism, he also became the inspiring symbol of anticommunism throughout the world. A line in Milton's "Paradise Lost" reminds me of Harry S. Truman: "And courage never to submit or yield." It was this courage that helped to keep the world free when he was President.

Almost 5 years after he advocated the doctrine named after him, Truman was told by Prime Minister Winston Churchill, "You, more than any other man, have saved Western civilization." Truman's great record of achievement reveals that Churchill did not exaggerate in his praise.

I salute this great former President, gallant fighter for freedom, and active statesman, as the 20th anniversary of the historic Truman doctrine is observed.

He is 82 now, but no matter how long he lives, the free people and free countries of the world will always remember Harry S. Truman with respect and a gratitude so deep, it cannot be measured or expressed with words.

UNNECESSARY COMPETITION FOR OUR INDUSTRIES FROM FOREIGN TEXTILE PRODUCTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the Representative from a district in Tennessee where the domestic apparel and related products industry is vital to our economy, I am most interested in seeing that our textile industries are not bled to

death by unnecessary competition from foreign products.

The apparel products industry in my district has helped the area lift itself out of economic stagnation to growth in both agriculture and industry. The textile industry in western Tennessee has fortified an otherwise declining agriculture industry by giving cotton and other related products a ready outlet.

The same situation presents itself throughout Tennessee, where the textile industries employ more than 125,000 persons, many of whom are in areas once economically depressed. In my own district, more than 50 percent of those employed in manufacturing trades are employed in textile mills and related manufacturing.

Therefore, the dangerous rise in foreign imports of apparel products during the past few years directly affects my district and my State. The health of this industry is vital to the economy of my State, and the influx of imports which threatens the gainful employment of my constituents necessarily alarms them.

In the western portion of Tennessee, where my district is located, cotton is an important product which is grown in all 11 counties I represent. It is the largest money crop in my district. Last year, the cotton acreage planted dropped by 112,000 acres from the previous year, and it is expected to fall in large proportions this year. Production fell last year by 265,000 bales from the previous year.

These reductions are being made in most respects to the need by the cotton industry to meet the supply and demand ratio of the product.

I mentioned cotton as just one example of the domestic products which have been affected by the rising tide of importations from cheap-labor countries. Tennesseans in the western part of our State are more directly concerned with this product than others, but all of us are concerned with the entire scope of the effect the decline of the textile industry has on the cotton industry.

The enormous influx of foreign produced and manufactured products have become so competitive with domestic products that its repercussions have affected both the textile industry and the cotton industry in my State. The same trend is apparent throughout the United States.

We need to take action to remedy these trends, and the action should be in the form of strengthening our domestic textile industries, not undermining them by allowing continued rise in importation of competitive products.

The State Department and various Federal agencies have allowed our textile program to be eroded. The importation of wool textiles and manmade fiber textiles must be realistically viewed from the standpoint of domestic economic concern, and, therefore, reason compels us to insist that our domestic industries be protected rather than to allow the continued trend. The extension of the international cotton arrangement for another 5 years seems warranted, but we must also insist that adequate enforcement of its provisions are carried out.

PROPOSED LAKE ERIE-OHIO RIVER CANAL

Mr. VIGORITO. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, an aroused public has again attacked the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which is trying to force down our throats the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal.

I am pleased this week to report that one of Empire State's most respected public bodies—the Power Authority of the State of New York—has fearlessly exposed the fallacious reasoning of the Corps of Engineers. A letter, which attacks the canal project, has been sent by the Honorable James A. FitzPatrick, chairman of the power authority, to Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Although dated November 18, 1966, its contents were made public only last week. It confirms all the worst fears of those of us who have believed that certain aspects of this wasteful project are probably illegal and would seriously affect the entire Great Lakes and Niagara Falls.

Chairman FitzPatrick informed General Cassidy of the results of several engineering studies carried on by both expert power authority personnel and reputable independent consulting engineering firms. The power authority's letter touches upon three main points which I will discuss only briefly here today.

First of all, the entire canal may be illegal. The Corps of Engineers admits that it will have to divert water from Lake Erie to fill the locks of the canal. It states, wrongly I believe, that this pumping of water from the lake will not have any effect on the water level. Whether it does or not, there is no argument that the water will have to be removed, if only temporarily. Under the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty between the United States and Great Britain, no diversion of water can be made from the Great Lakes without the permission of the International Joint Commission, made up of United States and Canadian representatives. Mr. FitzPatrick points out correctly that no such approval has been obtained, or even sought by the Engineers.

For several years, I have maintained that the canal, by adversely affecting the water level of Lake Erie, would seriously hinder, if not halt, dedicated efforts by the Federal Government, and State and local jurisdictions, to combat lake pollution. Lake Erie is the most seriously polluted of all the Great Lakes and interested parties on both sides of the border are trying to resolve this serious problem.

It is most unfortunate that the Corps of Engineers, by sponsoring this canal, will hamper attempts to clean up the lake, and even contribute to its further contamination. It is very gratifying to see that the independent studies of the

New York Power Authority reach this same conclusion. I think these latest developments should awaken the Corps of Engineers to the fact that their "castle in the air" is tumbling down around them. The least they can do is reopen public hearings so that they can see for themselves how the tide of public sentiment has mounted against them.

The power authority has also mentioned to Cassidy that the canal would reduce the flow of water over Niagara Falls, seriously diminishing the amount of power generated by electric generating turbines at the Falls. The authority's engineers estimate at least \$5 million worth of power to both the United States and Canadian users would be lost if the canal was built and the lake level reduced.

I have touched upon these points only briefly, Mr. Speaker. So that my colleagues in the House may become more fully aware of the details of these objections, I add to my remarks here the full text of Mr. FitzPatrick's excellently worded letter to the Corps of Engineers.

Further, with permission granted, I add the text of a short memorandum which reports on a conference held on February 1, 1967, between the Corps of Engineers and representatives of the New York State Power Authority. I believe this document will throw further light on the matter under discussion:

POWER AUTHORITY OF

THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

New York, N.Y., November 18, 1966.

Re Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal.

Lt. Gen. WILLIAM F. CASSIDY, U.S.A.,
Chief of Engineers,
Building T-7, Room 1230,
Gravelly Point, Va.

DEAR GENERAL CASSIDY: We have examined the report of the Board of Engineers dated September 7, 1966 with respect to the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, particularly paragraph 17 which reads as follows:

"17. Concern has been expressed by certain interests that operation of the proposed project may adversely affect water surface levels in Lake Erie and reduce flows at Niagara Falls for hydroelectric power generation. The Board notes that any diversion would be governed by the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, as amended."

As Chairman of the Power Authority, a non-profit self-supporting agency of the State of New York which constructed and operates hydroelectric plants on the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers, I submitted a recommendation in June 1965 that the Board disapprove the proposed canal on the grounds that it would require diversions of Great Lakes Basin waters which have not been approved by the International Joint Commission, and that it would cause very substantial injury to power users in the United States and Canada. Copies of that letter and supporting documents are enclosed.

We pointed out that if the project were constructed a minimum of over a million acre-feet of water would be permanently lost to Lake Erie and kept in dead storage in the Summit Reservoir and that if this water were allowed to follow its natural course from the Grand River to the Lakes it would produce \$3,000,000 worth of power in the United States and Canada. I also called the Board's attention to the fact that a substantial part of the water needed to operate the project would have to be pumped from Lake Erie and that this diversion would undoubtedly increase with the passage of time so

that ultimately substantial permanent diversions from Lake Erie would be inevitable.

The State of New York, subject only to the paramount power of the Federal Government over navigation, is the owner of the boundary waters within the State which it holds in trust for the people of the State and over which it exercises both sovereign and proprietary rights. In that respect its position is altogether different from that of states in the western part of the country where water rights are determined by appropriation or equitable apportionment. It has taken the leading role in the litigation against the State of Illinois which has gone on almost continuously during this century seeking to prevent or reduce the diversion of Great Lakes waters at Chicago.

The Provinces of Ontario and Quebec have a similar interest in preventing the diversion of the water from the Great Lakes. Like New York, they have large hydroelectric projects on the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers downstream from the proposed Ohio canal. Their rights are protected by international agreement.

When we discussed the Ohio canal with the District Engineer in 1965 we were assured that he considered any permanent diversion from the Lake to be contrary to the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty with Canada.

Since then, neither the Corps of Engineers nor any other party interested in the canal has offered any evidence that permanent diversions would not be needed and would not increase over the years, up to the point where they become a continuous drain on the limited resources of Lake Erie.

The Board's report fails to confirm the District Engineer's intention to avoid permanent diversion of Lake Erie water. In fact it appears to imply that such diversion is likely. It gives no indication that any adequate study has been made to show whether it would be possible to operate the project without using water from Lake Erie, particularly in dry-weather cycles when it is most urgently needed in the Great Lakes Basin.

Our opinion as to permanent diversions of water was based in part on the fact that the Mahoning River, a highly polluted stream, would be a southerly reach of the proposed canal system. Federal legislation to establish water quality standards, which was pending in 1965 and since has been enacted into law, confirms our belief that existence of this canal would lead to irresistible pressures to divert from Lake Erie all the water necessary to achieve standards of purity established for the Mahoning River, whatever those standards may be. This was precisely the situation at Chicago near the turn of the century which led to the diversion of enormous quantities of water from Lake Michigan into the Mississippi River.

We note that at the close of the last session the Congress appropriated an additional \$500,000 for the purpose of further study of the canal project. We respectfully recommend that some of this money be spent to determine the actual amount of water to be diverted from Lake Erie to operate the canal and to maintain water purity standards in the Mahoning River. Since the answers to these questions depend on the standards of water quality finally approved by the Secretary of Interior, we believe such study should begin after the Secretary has had a chance to review the standards now in effect in Ohio and Pennsylvania.

Even temporary diversions and diversions of tributary waters such as the Grand River are covered by the 1909 Treaty and cannot properly be undertaken without International Joint Commission approval if, as in the case of the Ohio canal, substantial injury to interests on the other side of the boundary would result. The Board's report acknowledges that diversion would be covered by the 1909 Treaty. It would appear logical that before large sums are expended to justify

construction of a canal which would result in diversion of water from the Great Lakes basin the Canadian position should be ascertained through the Department of State. Certainly it would be necessary for the two governments to refer a matter of this type to the International Joint Commission before either takes unilateral action involving the expenditure of large sums of money.

Despite the fact that the Board's report acknowledged that diversion necessary for the proposed canal would be subject to the prohibitions of the 1909 Treaty, the report makes only the most casual reference to the damage the diversion would cause to downstream interests. This reference was limited to the effect the diversion would have on the level of Lake Erie and the flows at Niagara Falls. No mention was made of the effect the diversion would have on hydroelectric developments on the St. Lawrence River of New York State through its Power Authority, the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec. Neither was any mention made of the effect diversion would have upon navigation in Lake Erie and the St. Lawrence including Montreal Harbor and the lower reaches of the river where the depth of water is of constant and vital concern.

No mention was made in the report of the property rights of New York State and the two Canadian provinces in the unimpaired flow of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers which are utilized for hydroelectric power purposes.

Downstream interests will undoubtedly be as zealous to protect their rights as they are with respect to diversion at Chicago which for the last nine years has been the subject of renewed litigation between the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota on one side and Illinois on the other and also the subject of considerable congressional activity.

We earnestly ask you to consider the propriety and wisdom of spending any substantial part of the money appropriated for the purpose of further engineering studies without first resolving the problems and issues pointed out herein.

We further earnestly request that in the report which the Corps of Engineers is currently preparing with respect to the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal the international questions raised herein and the downstream property rights referred to, be treated fully.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. FITZPATRICK,
Chairman.

POWER AUTHORITY OF
THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

New York, N.Y., February 3, 1967.

Memorandum to: W. S. Chaplin.

From: Scott B. Lilly and Asa George.

Subject: Proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal Project—Report on Conference Held on February 1, 1967, With Division Engineer—Ohio River Division—Corps of Engineers, Cincinnati, Ohio.

We attended a conference in Cincinnati, Ohio on February 1 arranged by the Great Lakes Commission with the Division Engineer, Ohio River Division, Corps of Engineers, to discuss the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal Project.

In attendance were the Division Engineer, Cincinnati; District Engineer, Pittsburgh; members of their staffs; District Engineer, Buffalo; Harley Lawhead of the Division Engineer's Office, Chicago and representatives of the Great Lakes Commission. The New York State delegation to the Great Lakes Commission was represented by Mr. Patrick J. Sullivan.

The overall presentation made by the Corps of Engineers at this meeting included a description of the activities of the Ohio River Division by Brig. Gen. Willard Roper, Division Engineer, followed by a general description of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal Project by Col. J. E. Hammer, District Engineer, Pittsburgh and the hydrology of the project by Mr. T. E. Reilly, District Staff Hydrologist. This presentation was followed by a question and answer period.

The highlights of this conference are summarized as follows:

The Pittsburgh District, Corps of Engineers, proposes substantial changes in its Ohio River-Lake Erie canal plan in order to meet objections raised by the Power Authority:

(1) The two million acre-foot Grand River (Summit) Reservoir would be filled entirely by retaining excess flows from the Mahoning River which is located in the Ohio River basin. The entire flow of the Grand River would be allowed to run into Lake Erie as it now does. Previously it had been proposed to fill the reservoir by retaining most of the flow of the Grand River as well as flows not needed in the Mahoning. The cost to power users in New York and Canada would have been about \$3 million. There is no doubt that it is physically possible to fill the reservoir without retaining any Grand River flows but this would of course increase the filling time, perhaps to six to seven years or longer. It would not necessarily delay operation of the canal, since the reservoir would be built first and the whole project would take at least 7 years to build.

(2) The Pittsburgh District hydrologist proposes to discharge all flood flows which could not be usefully stored in the Mahoning Valley down the Grand River to Lake Erie. He calculates that such flows would more than offset any evaporation losses from the reservoir and provide a net benefit of about a quarter of a million dollars to Great Lakes power production over a 17 year period.

These proposals apparently have the approval of the Division Engineer. However, they have not been discussed with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration or with communities in the Mahoning-Beaver River Valleys or with Ohio-Pennsylvania State officials. A representative of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources present at the conference indicated possible objection on the ground that Mahoning water should be stored for future needs in that watershed. No representative from Pennsylvania was present.

The Corps still takes the position that any necessary improvement in water quality standards in the Mahoning River is entirely a matter of local responsibility to be accomplished by cooling towers, secondary or tertiary treatment of wastes, etc. and not to any degree by dilution. The Corps' calculation of necessary flows in the Mahoning is based on present conditions which will undoubtedly be found unsatisfactory by the Water Pollution Control Administration (e.g. present maximum water temperature 110° as against a proposed maximum of 96°).

The Division Engineer rejected the suggestion that responsibility for water quality improvement should be specifically included in the list of local obligations which are part of the Corps' report on the project and a condition of its approval. He said there is no need to include such a condition because it would be unlawful for local communities to use project waters to solve their water quality problems.

It was brought out that the amount of water needed to satisfy navigation requirements for the project has been substantially reduced as a result of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors determination that a depth of 12 feet instead of 18 feet in the navigation channels would be adequate and consistent with depths in connecting waterways. There has also been a marked reduction in the estimates of potential canal tonnage which will correspondingly reduce water requirements for navigation.

There will be no change in the requirement that pumping facilities for navigation purposes be installed along the North Slope of the canal project. However, the capacity of these pumps is now estimated to be 1000 cfs instead of 1400 cfs as originally planned. Pumpage of water from Lake Erie to satisfy navigation requirements for operation of the three locks in the Lake Erie drainage basin will be a daily cycling operation requiring that water be pumped from Lake Erie to each of the three pools of the individual locks. The water would be returned daily to Lake Erie. As we have pointed out previously, and at this conference the mere existence of such facilities would be a continual temptation to divert water from Lake Erie.

The Corps has re-opened the question of the canal route from the Summit Reservoir to Lake Erie. In addition to the route along the Grand River to Painesville recommended in the District Engineers 1965 report and endorsed by the Board of Engineers, the Corps is now considering alternate routes by land cut directly to north of the Summit Reservoir and via the Ashtabula River to the northeast.

The District Engineer will issue a supplementary report indicating his final decision as to the route, outlining his new proposals for filling the Summit Reservoir and operating the project and defining the project boundaries in greater detail. He will also study the feasibility of constructing pump-storage facilities for power generation at the Lake Erie end of the project. He declines to make any statement as to when such a report may be available and indicates it will require at least the \$500,000 now available and the \$2 million which we understand is included in the President's proposed 1967-8 budget to pay for necessary studies.

The Division Engineer stated that when the supplemental report is completed the entire project will be submitted to the International Joint Commission for approval even though the present proposed plan of operation does not include any diversion from the Great Lakes. He does not plan to resubmit the matter to the Board of Engineers. The Division Engineer stated that copies of the supplementary report when completed will be made available to interested parties.

We will obtain written copies of statements made by the District Engineer and his hydrologist at the conference.

S. B. LILLY.
A. GEORGE.

PROPOSED OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL TO THE CONGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, there is scarcely a problem with which the present-day businessman must wrestle which does not relate to or involve some law, regulation, administrative ruling, constitutional provision, or court decision. As a result, even the smallest business has learned that legal counsel is not only desirable—it is a necessity. Therefore, it seems incredible that the Congress of the United States, with its responsibility for authorizing and appropriating billions of dollars annually to finance the largest business in the world, must perform this herculean task without such assistance.

Although the business of government

is the product of the sum total of actions of the legislative, executive and judicial branches, each branch, under the constitutional separation of powers, must ultimately discharge its responsibilities based on independent judgments. Under such a system, conflicting positions and divergent philosophies are inevitable, and when these occur, one branch cannot and should not be dependent on the other branches for guidance and direction.

While it is true that many among us are lawyers or have had years of experience in the field of law by virtue of our membership in this body, this does not lessen our need for legal counsel. It is also true that while our committees and subcommittees are staffed with competent attorneys, the authority of each committee is restricted—and properly so—to a relatively small and sharply defined area, there is no committee or office designed to be responsive to the broader needs of the Congress.

To meet this urgent requirement, I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution to establish an Office of General Counsel to the Congress. Much thought has gone into this resolution to insure that it does not impinge upon the executive branch. Its purpose is simply to provide the Congress with a general counsel to render advice and assistance as required in all matters of law, legislation, and the prerogatives of the Congress. Certainly there is no constitutional provision which prohibits the Congress from establishing such an office, and I hope this legislation may be scheduled for hearings promptly and enacted by both the House and the Senate.

THE GREAT DEBATE AND THIRD-CLASS MAIL

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the aroused conscience of the people is demanding that junk mail ought to pay its way. It is high time that the dimensions and proportions of this issue be clarified.

The chief spokesman for the third-class mail users is Harry J. Maginnis, with whom I have had two radio debates in 1962 and 1967 on the Steve Allison program. Mr. Maginnis has been working in this field for about 15 years and he represents his clients very well. Any lobbyist who concentrates on one area has somewhat of an advantage over a Member of Congress who must spread his interests and activities over many difference areas, and I must apologize in advance for the fact that I cannot spend as much time on this issue as the public interest warrants. Not being a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I do not have the expertise in treating this subject.

However, I feel very deeply that the public interest is at stake, and that more Members of Congress must take an ac-

tive part in this battle if the public interest is to be adequately protected. The average individual who receives "junk mail" does not have powerful lobbyists to speak for him, and thus must rely on the Members of Congress to defend his interests. Of course, the third-class mailers invariably state that they have taken surveys which "prove" that only 15 percent of the people object to receiving so much junk mail, and that my bill to raise third-class postal rates would drive them out of business, plus the fact that they contribute billions of dollars to the economy. I take all of these statements with huge grains of salt, as I hope will my fellow Members when they attempt to represent the public interest. It is hard to figure out such profitable businesses at the same time being driven to the wall.

I am including the texts of these radio debates because I believe my colleagues should know the intensity of the campaign now going on to keep these rates on junk mail absurdly low.

I am proud that, even though I do not have the thorough background which Harry Maginnis possesses after 15 years in this field, the public supported my position by a sharp majority in the telephone poll which followed each of our debates. The proportion of support for my position rose sharply between the 1962 and the 1967 debate.

TEXT OF RADIO DEBATE BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVE KEN HECHLER, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AND HARRY J. MAGINNIS, EXECUTIVE MANAGER, ASSOCIATED THIRD-CLASS MAIL USERS

(Moderator: Steve Allison, WWDC Radio, Feb. 6, 1962)

Our guests at the WWDC microphones Representative Ken Hechler, Democrat of West Virginia, and Mr. Harry J. Maginnis, Executive Manager Associated Third Class Mail Users. Now everybody's talking about it these days and this is most timely. Mr. Hechler voted against the ideas of Mr. Maginnis on this particular type of mail. Let's start with you, Harry. What is third class mail?

MAGINNIS. Third class mail is advertising mail essentially and has become in the last ten years the second largest advertising medium in the world. It consists of catalogues used by catalogue houses. It consists of shopping news in suburban neighborhoods. It consists of offers to sell books and magazines and it is what's known in advertising as the rifle approach. And, it has a use in our free-enterprise system which produces many sales, employs many people, and I suppose is the most misunderstood type of advertising in the United States simply because of the many attacks made on it by its vigorous . . .

MODERATOR. Let's get to that later.

MAGINNIS. Alright, we've stirred up the difficulty. Alright, that's what it is.

MODERATOR. It's commonly known as junk mail. And, don't kill me, Harry. I know you don't like the expression. It is the kind of mail, I should have said it myself, it's the kind of mail that comes to your house unsolicited and it says occupant sometimes without even your name on it. Now Representative Hechler, will you please tell us about the bill that just passed that is supposed to hurt these people to the point where they might have to stop using it?

HECHLER. You said "supposed to hurt." I don't think it really will hurt them. But, essentially, what happened was on the 24th of January, Steve, the House of Representa-

tives passed the Postal Rate Bill and I led a fight on the floor of the House to tack on an amendment which raised the rates on third-class mail. A 3½¢ minimum per piece was placed on rates for advertising circulars and other material put out by other than non-profit organizations.

MODERATOR. 3½¢, what was it before?

HECHLER. It had been 2½¢.

MODERATOR. Why did you do it?

HECHLER. I did it mainly, Steve, because of the tremendous support I had received from people all over the country. For example here is a lady from California who wrote me, "Dear Mr. Hechler, Thank you for your stand on junk mail. I don't mind paying taxes for useful purposes but I hate paying for the privilege of being irritated. Waste-basket emptying is not one of my favorite sports. Yours truly, Mrs. Norman Bonner, Rivermore, California." I got many, many letters like this, not only from housewives but from rural mail carriers, from postal clerks and carriers, from many many people all over the country and this caused me to take the stand which I did to raise the rates on third class mail. Not to make them prohibitive, I'm not interested in driving anybody out of business. I merely would like to see advertisers pay their own way.

MODERATOR. Harry, you told me once you were paying your own way. Now Ken tells us you are not.

MAGINNIS. Well, I can only say this, Steve, wherever we have appeared before an orderly body—a judicial body—they have ruled in our favor. Let me tell you what I mean. The House of Representatives had presented to it, within three months after Mr. Kennedy assumed office, a rate bill which had been tailored by Postmaster General Summerfield. Now the twenty five-man House Post Office Committee held hearings on this particular rate measure and I think they held something like 37 sessions, they heard 250 witnesses, they had 17 executive sessions, and after looking over the whole complex issue they ruled or they voted by a vote of 20 to 2 that the rate on third class mail had jumped 150% since 1952 vs. a 33½% increase on first class. And, the committee after listening to all of this information felt that that was all the market could bear and that more-over this category of mail was paying its way. Now I, when the issue got out on the House floor, a gag procedure was instituted . . .

MODERATOR. Hold it right there a minute, please Harry. Ken you heard Mr. Maginnis, what have you got to say. He said that the committee heard evidence saying they were paying their own way.

HECHLER. Well, when a committee of Congress reports, this is not conclusive and binding on Congress. Congress is a body which as a whole makes up its own mind. In this particular case, many of us in the House of Representatives felt that the action of the Committee did not raise the rates on third class mail enough. The Committee as I understand it raised the rates slightly but not nearly as much as many members of the House expressed to me they would like to have the rates raised. That's the reason that I introduced the amendment and I might say it got overwhelming support on the floor of the House. And, it went through by an overwhelming vote.

MODERATOR. Now Congressman Hechler, I know you. You are a professor, an educator, and an intellectual and I am sure that you wouldn't have presented this amendment unless you checked yourself. Now Mr. Maginnis makes a blanket statement, Congressman Hechler, that they are paying their way. Now are there statistics to prove that he is wrong?

HECHLER. The Postmaster General of the United States, J. Edward Day, in his testimony before the House of Representatives Post Office and Civil Service Committee stated and I am quoting him exactly on page

10 of the hearings, "We must recognize that third class is a commercial service with economic values not unlike thousands of other services furnished by industry. A piece of mail advertising copy is but one of many publicity alternatives." Now this is the important sentence which Postmaster General Day said in his testimony, "It's sponsors are no more privileged to receive government subsidy than those who use other advertising forms."

MODERATOR. The conclusion here is that they are not paying their way.

HECHLER. Exactly.

MODERATOR. What statistics do you have to prove that you are, Harry?

MAGINNIS. Well, I listened to Mr. Day's statement. He said we are not entitled to a subsidy and I am one who believes with what Mr. Day said. Now, we can only point to the record and prove our point. I think it is important that the public understand about this category of mail because we have been subject to these unfair attacks. This category of mail was created in 1928 at the request of the Post Office Department and by Calvin Coolidge. There was no lobbyist around urging its creation. Now the Post Office Department wanted this vast volume of mail because they have these very valuable postal clerks and carriers who have many slack periods. The same as Western Union at night time has a special rate for a night letter which is much cheaper than a day letter. And, they provided in the law that the mailer had to perform eleven manual handlings of the third class mail before they could enjoy the lower rate. He had to tie it, face it, sort it, not use stamps on it and put it in sacks to cities and states. At that time they ruled that third class mail should enjoy a substantial discount below the fully allocated cost for the deferred service which it would receive. Now in all the years from 1928 up to the very present the recovery of cost has been 75%. Now suddenly somebody comes along and says this cost recovery should be 94 or 99% and we say that this is an unfair cost recovery.

MODERATOR. Hold it a minute, I want to ask you Harry. You say that the recovery is 75%. What is it on first class mail? Do we know?

MAGINNIS. Yes, we know that over the years the cost recovery on first class mail has averaged about 130%. Now it is important to understand why this is so and I will give you a simple illustration why it is so. Let's take the National Theatre. We are all familiar with this legitimate theater. You have in that theatre, let's assume 1,000 seats. Now if you figure out the cost of maintaining each seat in the National Theatre you will find out that it is exactly the same. The mortgage, the cost of players on the stage, the musicians and so forth. However, the National says we will charge \$2.25 for the balcony seat but we will charge \$6.50 for the fifth row orchestra. So here you have what is known as differential pricing. It is used on airlines as you know. It is used on railroad trains. It is used in Western Union as I pointed out. And, it is used in the case of third class mail because we are a deferred category of mail and we provide a fill-in, profitable category of mail to the Post Office.

MODERATOR. Ken, your stand is that this particular type mail shouldn't get, should pay at least its own way. Harry himself, you just said it only pays 75%. Now Congressman Hechler's idea, should pay it all. Is that the idea, Ken?

HECHLER. I would say that my amendment brings it up to about 92 or 93% and I think this is fair and legitimate. This is less than 100%. It is not hurting, it is less than cost and I think it is not going to drive anybody out of business. Now, Steve, when you give an ad over this program who pays for this ad?

MODERATOR. The sponsor.

HECHLER. The sponsor pays. He doesn't get any government subsidy, does he?

MODERATOR. No.

HECHLER. Therefore, why should an advertising firm get a government subsidy from the taxpayers for advertising through the mail? It just doesn't make sense to me.

MAGINNIS. Steve, I would like to put it a different way because this can get awfully complex.

MODERATOR. All right, if you can keep it simple.

MAGINNIS. Let's keep it very simple. Third class mail generates revenues annually of \$500,000,000 into the Post Office Department. This is enough to pay the salaries of 100,000 carriers. Now let's assume that the category of mail be eliminated entirely and this has been proposed on the House floor and may very well be proposed in the Senate. If you eliminate the category you lose \$500,000,000 bucks. I mean right off you just don't get the revenue but you don't reduce the cost of running the Post Office because the overhead is consistent and it goes on and on. You don't lay off carriers, clerks and so forth they just don't have anything to do during...

MODERATOR. Before I forget, I have a question I want to ask you. I know your point now and we will get back to it. But Ken says his amendment will bring your revenue to 92%. Is this so if some of the boys will be thrown out of business? Won't it even at 3 1/2% go down to less than 70%?

MAGINNIS. Well—

MODERATOR. Get the idea?

MAGINNIS. I get the idea. You are talking about a diminishing volume based on rates and I can give you illustrations of what happens. At one time we had in the United States the poor man's letter, the penny postcard. Now when the postcard was a penny we had five billion, six hundred million such cards in the mail. As the rate went up to two cents and finally to three cents, the volume has reduced to two billion, four hundred postcards. Now, it is proposed to make the rate on postcards four cents. In fact, the House approved such a rate and I will venture or make a bet on it if somebody wants to take it that this four cent rate will force down further the postcards to a volume of about one billion, eight.

MODERATOR. Will it hurt percentage wise?

MAGINNIS. What do you mean will it hurt percentage wise?

MODERATOR. I mean will the Post Office Department, will it cost them more money to deliver the postcards at four cents.

MAGINNIS. No it will cost them the same but when you have in the postal establishment 600,000 employees, which is the biggest of all businesses in the world with all the automatic equipment they are putting in, you have to have a vast volume of mail to keep them occupied. Now if you eliminate these eighteen billion pieces of third class mail you are in real trouble, believe me.

MODERATOR. Well, Ken, here is my question. I didn't make it clear to Harry let me try it with you. Seventy five per, you are trying to bring this up to 92% at 3 1/2%, if half the boys who use this mail go out of business will it still be 92%?

HECHLER. Well, all I can say is that in the raising of the rates over the past few years, the amount of third class mail has actually increased. I mean it hasn't had an effect of decreasing it and I would like to give you just one or two figures, to prove precisely the point I am making.

In the fiscal year 1958, 988,620 pounds of third class mail was sent out. In 1959, in thousands of pounds, 1,156,000. 1960, 1,276,000, so it has gone up each year despite the raise in rates of the past few years. Well, even if the volume goes down, gee this would be wonderful wouldn't it, because we wouldn't have so much junk mail.

MODERATOR. Yeah, we will get to that later. Cause I am against you with that. But...

MAGINNIS. I would like to answer that question, Steve, because he quotes fiscal year figures of 58 and 59.

MODERATOR. I will let you do that, Harry. I just want to clear it up in my own mind. If it goes down in volume, won't that 92% income of yours go down with it?

HECHLER. Well it may go down, yes. That is a possibility, I will admit that. But it hasn't.

MODERATOR. If your boys go out of business, it won't be 92% Harry it might be down to 60.

MAGINNIS. I think you have made your point. I think you are quite correct, too.

MODERATOR. I'm not trying to make a point. I'm just asking questions.

MAGINNIS. I think it is quite true, yes.

MODERATOR. Alright, go ahead with your...

MAGINNIS. My point is about the diminishing volume of third class mail. I want to answer this because we have got to get it straight. When the 1958 rate act, we had a rate you know in 1958, they provided a two-step increase in third class mail on this minimum piece rate from 2 cents to 2 cents in January 1, of 1959 and in 1960 July 1 they raised it to 2 1/2 cents. Now the figures that we developed before the Committee, Congressman Lesinski of Michigan, who is a fine member of the Committee asked the Department for figures and he found that there was a diminishing volume of mail. And, of course, questions arose that it might have been a further diminishing volume of the mail except as President Kennedy was running for office and he flooded the country with a vast amount of occupant mail. He blanketed Maryland, every house in Maryland with an occupant newspaper. And, other politicians were using mail in this political year so it throws off your figures as to the use by businessmen of this type of mail.

HECHLER. I just wanted to say, incidentally, that as a politician that I have never used occupant mail or third class mail. Number two, I am opposed to the move which was made in Congress last year to allow members of Congress to send out occupant mail under their frank. I opposed it publicly, I stated publicly in the debates in the House that I opposed it but Mr. Maginnis has mentioned the fact that this is a great billion-dollar-a-year business. And, it would seem to me that if the business is so prosperous that it ought to be able to pay the advertising costs. You pay your telephone bills. You pay your freight. You don't ask the government to step in and subsidize your telephone bills or your freight. You don't go to your printer and say your rates are too high and unless you get the government to step in and subsidize your or my printing cost, I'll have to go out of business. That's free enterprise and incidentally, Harry, I have the greatest admiration for the man that you formerly worked for, Senator Robert A. Taft, who is honored in President Kennedy's book, "Profiles in Courage." Senator Taft was one of the really outstanding exponents of free enterprise in this nation. I should think he would turn over in his grave if he heard you advocating the government subsidy for third class mail. Why can't these businesses pay their advertising costs? If they go out of business under our free competitive enterprise system, then they don't deserve to stay in business. Why should the taxpayers pay to keep them in business?

MAGINNIS. I think you twist my words, doctor, because I haven't said that we enjoy a subsidy nor have I said that we want one. But I would like to say that I do base my whole philosophy in life on what Senator Taft had to say about fact. He gave a definition of fact and he said, "Fact has neither longitude nor latitude, nor expansion. You are either right or you're wrong and you can't be nearly either." And, I think I am right on this one.

MODERATOR. (Intermission for News).

MODERATOR. Our guests at the WWDC microphones, Representative Ken Hechler, Democrat of West Virginia, and Harry Maginnis, Executive Manager, Associated Third Class Mail Users. Now ladies and gentlemen my question is to Congressman Ken Hechler. He pointed out before that Congressmen had the right to use this third class mail and he said he himself wouldn't. Now is it because of the principle involved, or do you think people get angry with the politician who sends this mail to their mail boxes?

HECHLER. I think both. I would say perhaps more the second part of your question, Steve. I think people do get angry. They are sick and tired of having their mail boxes overloaded with things that just go into the wastebasket, as my good friend Congressman Morris Udall of Arizona so well stated on the floor of the House, "Housewives are tired of being conveyor belts between the mail boxes and the wastebaskets."

MODERATOR. I would like to get into that a little later. But, right now I want to stay in politicians.

HECHLER. Okay.

MODERATOR. I think that maybe one of the most astute politicians and you know the difference between a politician and a statesman. A statesman is a politician who thinks. An example here is about a great statesman, I know you will agree, President Kennedy.

HECHLER. Yes, decidedly.

MODERATOR. Who decided that you were wrong when he did what Harry suggested a few minutes ago. He sent the whole state of Maryland this occupant mail. So obviously he doesn't go along with you when you say that housewives won't vote for the men who send them this thing.

HECHLER. Now I can see why President Kennedy only won by less than 1 per cent. He shouldn't have used so much "occupant" mail.

MODERATOR. Mr. Nixon didn't use it, Harry?

MAGINNIS. Didn't use it unfortunately. He would have won otherwise.

MODERATOR. Yeah. Would you like to say something in what Congressman Hechler said about Congressmen? We'll get to housewives in a minute.

MAGINNIS. Yeah, I'd like to talk about political mail by Congressmen and comment on it because I think the people will be interested in it. One of the greatest gimmicks that has developed in the House of Representatives certainly is the taking of questionnaires among their constituency. Now these are either done by the occupant method or by the addressing of the actual envelopes. One way to keep your name before the electoral is to send out about 140,000 questionnaires on a letterhead which is paid for by the government and which you send out free of charge under the frank. Now these questions generally are loaded and not designed to elicit information but rather to keep the name of the Congressman before the constituency. We have the case of Mr. Broyhill sending out such a questionnaire here some weeks ago and there has been a lot of criticism of the nature of the questions he asked. Now if one looks into the House document room and finds out how much of this mail is going out, you will find that Congressmen themselves believe in getting their message across to their constituency through the mails at election time. Our own people...

MODERATOR. Let Ken answer you.

MAGINNIS. Alright, fine.

HECHLER. Well, I'm not going to speak for any other members of Congress and their motives. All I can say is, Harry, that several weeks ago when I had a questionnaire to send out I put advertisements in three newspapers in my district. I paid for those advertisements. I printed the questions in the advertisements. I asked the voters to clip and return the advertisements. The return

was tremendous. I was very very agreeably surprised with the amount of interest displayed. I'm just speaking for myself and not impugning the motives of anyone else who sends out questionnaires. But, it seems to me that when you want to advertise your point of view that you ought to pay for it and you oughtn't to expect the government to subsidize it.

MAGINNIS. I'll say amen to that, doctor. And, I might say while I'm here that I defend all forms of advertising because I think it's good for our free enterprise system and keeps the economy rolling.

MODERATOR. That's right. Why didn't you buy my radio time. What's that newspaper ad you're talking about for your questionnaire?

HECHLER. How's that again?

MODERATOR. Why didn't you buy radio time instead of a newspaper ad?

HECHLER. Well, it's very difficult—

MODERATOR. To write on a radio.

HECHLER. Thank you, Steve. You said it better than I could.

MODERATOR. All right, now your next point, Harry, on Congress or do you want to get off that and we'll go to housewives.

MAGINNIS. I don't want to get on that too much. The incumbent, I believe, has a tremendous advantage because of his use of the franking privilege. And, he does send out a lot of mail and I don't blame him for doing it, but the fellow who is trying to get his seat from the outside does have a difficult time.

MODERATOR. Alright, let's get on to the housewife. Mr., ah, doctor Hechler a few minutes ago read a very impassioned letter by an irate woman who goes to the wastebasket. Do you have letters Harry from poor, lonesome shutins who never get anybody writing to them, who love this kind of mail so they can read something?

MAGINNIS. No, but I have some statistics and I will give a few examples of how the housewife does read her mail. Let's get clear on one thing, about cluttering up and getting vast volumes of mail. Each housewife, I would say receives on the average about 1 and 3/4 pieces of mail a day when you multiply the number of housewives by the volume of third class mail. Now I will give you an illustration of mail that is read and avidly looked for. We have out here in Silver Spring, you had your own advertiser here, Vincent and Vincent in the Wheaton Shopping News or the Wheaton Shopping Center, there is published in the Silver Spring area a shopping guide which is somewhat akin to a newspaper. And, it is sent out under occupant mail and I can tell you that the housewives wait avidly for the newspaper because they want to know what is for sale in their own community. Now if suddenly a new home is put up for instance and the occupant's name doesn't happen to be on a plate and that housewife doesn't get her newspaper, she is calling up the publisher immediately and saying put me on the list. Now I will give you another illustration of the returns on this type of mail. The mail we see most often in the occupant category are the soap coupons, which are put out by the great soap companies of America, Procter & Gamble and Lever Brothers. These are sent out to every household in America and they know down to the finest decimal point what the response is because the coupons are cashed in with the grocery store and at some point Procter & Gamble has to pay the grocery man. Now, I don't know the exact statistics on each mailing, but I will tell you that the response is fantastic, somewhere near 30, 33%.

MODERATOR. Ken, to get back to you a minute. A little bit ago, if I remember correctly, you said one of the main reasons you don't use this occupant mail is because housewives get angry and won't vote for you. But, from what Harry tells us, and what we

can tell just by thinking, advertisers wouldn't use this if it didn't pay off. And, if housewives were angry at this they, you know sometimes people don't like a television show they say I ain't going to use that product, because they're loading me with commercials.

HECHLER. All right, you say it pays off, Steve, but it only pays off because the government helps pay it off. I don't think that's free enterprise. I think if the advertiser thinks it's so important, and makes so much money from it, and provides so many jobs, then he ought to be willing to pay its cost.

MODERATOR. Well, we will come back to that, too. But right now we are talking about the moral idea. Oh, not the moral idea this woman who wrote to you, she's irate. This particular woman getting this occupant mail wouldn't use the fellow who advertises that way. But, from what Harry tells us and what we know all these fellows in business they must be doing great.

HECHLER. Well, all I can say is that I've received hundreds of letters complaining about too much junk mail, and complaining about having to pay for it and I'm sure that I would receive more if I asked for them. Is it alright to ask for them on this program? I would like to ask anyone who is disgusted with the amount of junk mail that they are receiving to write to Congressman Ken Hechler, 137 House Office Building. Please don't write "occupant," 137 House Office Building, just write Congressman Ken Hechler.

MODERATOR. Ken, you know that Maginnis is right. You know that. But the fact still remains with your hundreds of letters, multiply that times 50,000, you still haven't got one infinitesimal amount of people who get these things and use them.

HECHLER. Well, all I can say is, maybe they get them and use them, as I am sure they do, but the advertiser should be willing to pay the cost more fairly. But I think Harry is an honest and sincere person.

MODERATOR. Sometimes.

HECHLER. He has presented his case very strongly. I might say. Harry, I think they ought to raise your salary. I think you do a terrific job.

MODERATOR. He's done such a great job that he lost the whole case. Didn't he? He wins the battle but he loses the war. And, I don't think it's his fault. Frankly, Ken, with due respect to you I admire and respect you for many many reasons. I love your record in Congress I think that this is in the same category as closing the loopholes. We had men here last night who showed us that the government will lose money if they close these so-called loopholes on expense accounts. But, politically it's a wonderful thing. Because politically a little fellow can't afford to go to these expensive restaurants. The same thing here if the people who write these letters who Congressmen pay attention to and, Harry, here's where you are falling down. You have got to get people to write to Ken and other Congressmen telling how they use them. The fact that you show statistics how they use these occupant mails, this isn't going to convince a Congressman who has to ask for votes.

MAGINNIS. This is the only forum opened to me, Steve. This is a very unusual radio station, as you know, and our competitors the CBS, NBC, ABC, and ten thousand newspapers in America are not about to publish any complimentary word about a competitive advertising medium. So this is the only place I have a right to say what I really feel on this issue, and that's why I'm here.

HECHLER. But, Harry, you were just telling me before we went on this program about a wonderful newspaper in my district, The Ravenswood News which had published an editorial critical of me for what I said about junk mail. So I say a courageous independ-

ent newspaper like the Ravenswood News which has taken a forthright position indicates that we should not condemn the newspapers. They think independently for themselves.

MODERATOR. You had to open your mouth. I told you not to get friendly with him, didn't I? When you were sitting here.

MAGINNIS. Steve, let me make a point. I have this particular editorial before me and I'd like to read one sentence from it. This is the Ravenswood News and they say this, "We are sure that the weekly circulars mailed by Crows Market Service," I might say that the Crows Market Service is the finest company in the whole world bar none. It's in Congressman Hechler's district, "that these circulars mailed by Crows Market served to help housewives fulfill their task of keeping a better house or the mailers of Jackson County people received this week from the Ben Franklin Five and Ten, will hardly be considered junk mail by a majority who received them and reacted to the various bargains offered." Now this is the feeling of one newspaperman in Congressman Hechler's own district. I might say that this newspaper is a weekly. And, he uses the presses to create some of this direct mail on the other six days of the week. That's the way he makes his living. He has a payroll of \$40,000 and he keeps people hired. So, I think this is a fine newspaper. I am not attacking the newspapers. I'm just saying they have a selfish interest in trying to knock down the second-largest advertising medium in the world.

HECHLER. The Ravenswood News certainly isn't trying to knock them down. And, I admire this stand that they have taken on this. I think this is good. It's good healthy criticism for a Congressman to get from a courageous, independent newspaper in his district. It's a Democratic newspaper, too. And, I admire them.

MAGINNIS. I do have one witness here, Steve, I think I can quote him. I think one of your best friends and my best friends is Paul Nagle, who is with the Postal Clerks of the United States. They just published an editorial in their monthly magazine entitled "It's not junk mail." Now answering the point you tried to emphasize, Steve. He says, "The businessmen . . ."

MODERATOR. Who's he?

MAGINNIS. Paul Nagle and his group. "The businessmen who spend vast sums annually on third class mailings are not just speculating. They know from experience, and it can almost be measured scientifically, that their postage investments are going to return a certain percentage of profit." And, then he says further, "This term junk mail is strictly a propaganda phrase coined to dirty up an area of promotional enterprise in the endless competition for the advertising dollar." Now these are the clerks who have to handle the mail and they like it.

MODERATOR. Question.

MAGINNIS. Yes sir?

MODERATOR. I don't know if it's to you, Harry, maybe it's to you, Ken. I don't know. I sometimes get books through the mail and the book says if you don't want it send it back. I didn't order it! Does this come under that category?

MAGINNIS. No. Books are under the book rate, Steve. Anything over 16 ounces gets in the parcel post category.

MODERATOR. I think this is junk mail. If I don't order something and they just deliver it to me and ask me for a check, boy, there is something wrong with that. Could you do anything about that one, Ken?

HECHLER. Well, that's terrible. It's junk mail. I define junk mail as that portion of 3rd class mail that you don't ask for, you don't want when you receive it and it goes directly in the wastebasket when you get it.

MODERATOR. The problem there, if it goes in the wastebasket how come these guys keep on doing it. That's the whole problem, Ken.

HECHLER. Evidently it must bring in some money. I'll agree with Harry that it brings in some money. But, if it brings in the money, then they ought to pay for it just like you pay when you advertise in the newspaper or like you advertise or your advertisers advertise over your program. Could I comment for a minute on the point which Harry made about how the postal people feel about this type of mail? Let me quote a letter I got from a rural carrier in Jasper, Florida named Leonard B. Register, dated January 24, 1962. Mr. Register says, "Thank God for Congressmen who have guts enough to stand up against the national lobby in Washington. I have been carrying the mail rural route here for 40 years and this class of mail has reached such proportions that the recipients keep asking that it not be placed in their boxes. I have seen the ground in and around mail boxes look as if a wastepaper basket had been emptied. For 20 years I was Scoutmaster here and was asked on many occasions to have the boys in my troop collect wastepaper which we very readily did. And, yet our government at the very same time permitted this third class mail waste with little or no effort to correct it." I have several other letters from rural carriers. Here is one from Connersville, Indiana that says "Every day I have complaints from patrons on receiving this worthless mail." I might say, too, I don't want to get Paul Nagle into trouble but he came up to me and congratulated me after my amendment went through.

MAGINNIS. Oh, my. Now, we are in real trouble. Paul did that? Oh, my. Oh, my. Oh, my. Oh, my. I don't want to get into that. Incidentally, in answer doctor, if I may, I think one of the great labor leaders of the United States is William C. Doherty of the National Association of Letter Carriers. He represents all of them except the rural boys and that's another story. The most avidly sought after jobs in the Federal Government are rural carriers and I don't want to go into a discussion of it. But here's what Bill Doherty had to say, in a speech to my organization. He says, "I want to put on record the National Association of Letter Carriers with this statement of policy: We believe that all mail is good and all classes of mail are good. We of the National Association of Letter Carriers have watched with some astonishment therefore recent planned assault on the part of some representatives of the Postmaster General, referring to Mr. Summerfield, on third-class mail."

MODERATOR. Well,

MAGINNIS. This is Bill Doherty talking.

MODERATOR. Well, of course, the answer to that is the more mail that is delivered the more fellows get jobs, Ken.

HECHLER. I say all mail is good. I am not attacking third-class mail, nor asking that it be abolished.

MODERATOR. I love mail.

HECHLER. Third-class mail is so good that it ought to pay its way.

MODERATOR. We will get into that. I've got some questions here. The whole thing boils down simply ladies and gentlemen after we talked about whether those people wanted it or not, "Does it pay its way?" And, I think what we're going to do is ask Harry Maginnis to show us how it does. He told us a little bit more about, a little bit ago, about the slack time in the Post Offices. How the boys have time, they cannot be fired, and it's in this time that they do these third-class mail things. But first I have some questions here. Will not a postal rate increase provide and increase business tax deduction, thus raising additional revenue for the Post Office Department but less for Internal Revenue?

HECHLER. Do you want me to handle that?

MODERATOR. Yes, it's to you.

HECHLER. Well, I'd be very pleased to handle that. The question of taxes was brought up because when a housewife mails a first-class letter she gets no tax deduction. But,

when a business engages in third-class mail, of course, it can deduct the cost from its taxes.

MODERATOR. If it costs 3 cents for first-class mail in 39 and the value of a dollar is now about 50 cents, then why should first-class mail not be increased to 6 cents now?

HECHLER. Do you want me to handle that?

MODERATOR. Yeah.

HECHLER. I think the 5 cent rate is a good, acceptable rate. And, I would say that if the rate were raised to 6 cents and if we followed Harry Maginnis's suggestion to keep third class rates down. I think you'd have a wholesale revolution on your hands. I don't think that the American public would ever accept a first-class raise to 6 cents at a time when third-class rates were not raised.

MODERATOR. Do you want to say something, Harry.

MAGINNIS. Oh, I think there is the myth about the use of first-class mail in the United States and I would like to clarify it. The largest users of first class mail in the United States are businessmen themselves, that's 75% of all first class. Certainly the third-class businessmen themselves use some of the largest volumes of this kind of mail. All of the utilities in the United States use first-class mail and eventually the cost of the extra postage is passed on in the way of increased light bills, gas bills, and so forth. The very largest user of first-class mail are the 7 levels of government: state, county, municipal and so forth. When the rate goes up on their first-class mail, eventually a tax increase is put into effect to pay the bill. Now getting down to facts of the matter. Seventy five per cent of all mail is used by business. Now Mr. Kennedy comes along and he says we are going to raise \$600,000,000 to help balance the budget. Now I can tell you that the net the Federal Government is going to raise will be far less than that. I would say any tax bill such as is proposed by the House would raise closer to \$400,000,000. Postage is proper cost of doing business and will be deducted. Now unfortunately one only pays taxes when he makes a profit and I will say to you here and now that if this unreasonable rate is put into effect, it will reduce sales through direct mail by from 5 to 6 billion dollars. And, in the end the Federal Government will be the loser.

MODERATOR. All right Congressman Hechler don't you approve of the Committee system?

HECHLER. Yes, I approve of the Committee system. I think it's a fine thing but I would throw back this question: don't you approve of the House of Representatives? They, after all, are the decision-making body which passes on and approves or disapproves what the Committee recommends. In this case they disapproved. The entire House of Representatives is properly the final arbiter.

MODERATOR. This was a question from the floor. Did you want to say something Harry?

MAGINNIS. I'd like to answer the question because it puzzled me. I told you about my belief in fact and Taft's principles. In the eleven years I've been in this rate picture, neither the House nor the Senate has taken a record vote. I mean where you stand up and be counted. Now this bill was pushed through on the House floor in a period of five hours and when it came to voting even the final bill up or down, the leadership got together both Republicans and Democrats and said don't put us on record. We don't want to be for a postal rate increase. And on Mr. Hechler's amendment there was two minutes of debate. And, there was a voice vote on it and a big shout went up and I would say the vote, doctor, was about three to one against us. And, I think it was based on passion and on propaganda more than fact. It disturbed me very much just as a citizen that the Committee which had worked so hard had over, had overruled within two minutes, all of the good work it had put into effect. Because the Committee did report out a bill, raising third class rates, there were about eight rates

on third class mail, just not on the minimum piece rate but on the odd size piece, the pound rate, the catalogue rate, the non-profit rate and the Committee had worked out a very delicate complex formula which would have raised \$63,000,000. And, they thought that was all the market could bear. But in two minutes all this good work was overthrown on the floor without a record vote of any kind. And, as I say it disturbed me.

HECHLER. Harry, could I answer that, Harry?

MAGINNIS. Sure, sure.

HECHLER. You say there was only two minutes of debate. I have the Congressional Record before me and I spoke myself for five minutes. After that Congressman Corbett, your good friend from Pennsylvania spoke for five minutes in opposition. We then engaged in an exchange with Congressman Corbett. Then Congressman Bailey of West Virginia came in for three or four minutes more. Then Congressman Joelson of New Jersey came in and said, "This is a business whose only stock and trade is the use of postal facilities and that's what they're in business for." There was some more debate by Mr. Lesinski of Michigan. Then Congressman Herlong of Florida came along and spoke for approximately five minutes. The Record proves that the debate, when you add all those things up, certainly was not confined to two minutes.

MAGINNIS. Well, my recollection of the debate, and I sat in the gallery, doctor, was that you made your motion and that Mr. Corbett got up. Now I'm familiar with the House rule that anybody could have spoken out the last word and gotten five minutes for himself. And, it was at this point that the administration was either going to stand behind its bill or not stand behind it and everybody remained mute on the thing with the exception of Congressman Corbett, who was the ranking Republican on the Committee. Now it so happens that one of our friends Congressman Johansen of Michigan, a good friend of Mr. Summerfield, happened to be in the hallway at the time the amendment was offered. By the time he got back the whole issue had been decided. We were deciding here the fate of many thousands of businessmen. And, my recollection is that it couldn't have been over ten minutes any how. The discussion on this vital section of the bill. But, no record vote was taken, I'm sure of that.

HECHLER. Well, your supporters could have had a division, you could have had a vote by tellers, but as one of the leaders remarked to me afterward he said, "I was really surprised that the voice vote was so overwhelming that if we had asked for a teller vote or division vote we would have been beaten by your forces." And, gee that was the first time I realized I had forces. But, anyway, it seems to me that the proponents of your position could have very easily asked for a division vote or a teller vote. A division vote, of course, can be asked for by one individual member. And, a teller vote by one-fifth of the members present. That could have been done, it seems to me. And, I might add also that Congressman Lesinski, a friend and supporter of yours, spoke also on the resolution.

MAGINNIS. Well, I might say as one reads the Congressional Record on the following day and I'm sure, Steve, is familiar with this, everybody extends his remarks and as one reads the record one would think it was about a 14-hour debate on this whole issue.

HECHLER. If the gentleman will yield, I remember this day very clearly because this, of course, was a red-letter day in my life and every single word was reported in the Record precisely as spoken.

MODERATOR. Hold your statement while we have an intermission.

MODERATOR. I tell you what, ladies and gentlemen, so far you have been needed Ken because Harry brought his boys in tonight

and you ain't got a friend here. So I'll tell you what maybe we'll get on the phones. Maybe Ken Hechler has got some friends on the phone. So let's leave him alone with the floor for a while with your questions, fellows.

HECHLER. Oh, I don't mind.

MODERATOR. You don't mind?

HECHLER. No, I don't mind at all. It's a challenge.

MODERATOR. Well you do away with this mail what are you going to do with the door-to-door salesman who can be more of a pain in the neck can't they? Were you ever taking a bath with the phone ringing? Let's get into the . . . Let's get into the financial structure for a minute. Harry, you say that you don't want the government to subsidize you.

MAGINNIS. Right.

MODERATOR. Before you told me you were only paying 75% of your way. Isn't that 25% subsidy?

MAGINNIS. Well, it's based on cost ascertainment figures and every postal expert in the world has said this is just a starting point in rate making you see. And, somebody at some point has to say what are we going to charge for this premium category of first class cause it's . . . let me put it this way. There are thirty differences between a first class letter and a third class letter. Thirty differences. Now we've taken ads put in the newspapers to describe these differences but when the fellow who gets them looks at them, physically they look the same. But they are two different animals entirely. Now I happen to represent all the third class mailers in the United States and I have never in my life sent out a bulletin, and I send out one almost weekly, by third class mail. Now if I wanted to take seven weeks to get to the West Coast with my bulletin I would use third class mail but I put first class on because I want that premium service, I want to be able to drop it in the mail box in my building and thus I use it. So this is how people figure on differential pricing. In fact the question was sent up here, "Does WWDC use a differential pricing system for prime evening time and morning hours?" I don't know whether you do or you don't, certainly tv does. So here the costs are the same of running the station in the early morning hours or at eight o'clock or nine o'clock in the evening. So you have different pricing and it's the same thing in the Post Office.

HECHLER. I think Harry is absolutely right that differential pricing is necessary whether it's at the National Theatre or WWDC or in the Post Office. And, we do have differential pricing because in the amendment that I proposed which carried there is a difference and differential pricing: 3½ cents for third class, 5 cents for first class. That is differential pricing. Yet it's more nearly paying the cost of third class than the rate which had been previously proposed and supported by third class mail users.

MODERATOR. Harry you didn't expect to get away with 2½ cents when they raised first class from 4 to 5. If they raised first class 4 to 5 you knew you were going to get a jump, too. Didn't you?

MAGINNIS. Well, from the practical, political standpoint, I expected it. But, all I can do is point to history in the Post Office Department. When our rate was a penny back in 1928, the first class rate was 2 cents so you had a ratio of 50% to it. So there came a time when the first class mail went up to 3 cents. We remained at a penny for a long time so the ratio was really only one third. Now this was straightened out when the four cent rate was put into effect in 1958. Our rate went up to 2 cents so you had this 50% ratio which has existed for countless years. Now the thing got out of balance when another increase was made in third class up to 2½ cents so you have a ratio of 2½ to 4. Now the House Committee felt

that when the first class rate went to 5 the ratio ought to be 2½ cents to five because the mailers have to perform all these services and they have to be taken into account in figuring the cost of handling the mail. So a rational committee agreed with it.

HECHLER. Once again I think Harry has made a very strong argument and I'd like to compliment him on it. When the rate was 1 cent, when was it first put into effect, third class mail paid 97% of its way. However, as the years went by the third class mail paid less and less of its way. In 1936 it paid only 73%, 1946 only 61%, 1955 down to 59%. The cost ascertainment figures of the Post Office Department reveal that a 2½ cent rate would only pay cost of mailing third-class mail, did you say 75%, Harry. I'll accept your figure at 75% of the cost of mailing third-class.

MAGINNIS. There's only one hole in the argument, doctor. And, it always comes up in the committees. The Post Office Department always points to the year 1926 to show that third class mail paid 97% of its way. I think that's the figure you're referring to.

HECHLER. That's right.

MAGINNIS. However, bulk mail wasn't created until 1928 so you're comparing oranges you know with lemons or something. You've got to start with 1928. Now if you look at your first cost ascertainment figures, which came out in 1929, up to the present the average has been 75%.

HECHLER. But, it went down though, didn't it so that in 1955 it was only 59%?

MAGINNIS. That's right it dropped down. It dropped down and there was a need to increase it and the Congress did increase it. Now in the last rate act they brought the ratio up to about 74% of the cost recovery. But, they did an unusual thing in 1952, they created the non-profit category of mail which hadn't existed before that time so that now we have 4 billion pieces of non-profit third class mail that go at a cent and a quarter. Now your amendment didn't affect this non-profit mail so the business users are supposedly supposed to pick up the calculated subsidy on these four billion pieces of mail and I say that's unfair.

HECHLER. Harry, isn't it true that the nature of this third class mail has changed considerably over the years? It has gotten a little bit heavier, it takes different, newer equipment and machines to handle it and this perhaps has contributed to the increase in the cost so far as the Post Office Department is concerned. I don't know the answer to that. I'd just be interested in your reaction to that.

MAGINNIS. I couldn't give you a figure on that, doctor. Whether the average weight per piece is heavier now than it was years ago, I just don't know. But, weight is not the prime factor in the setting of rates. It's the manual handling of pieces of mail. And, I'd like to point out a figure here to show how discriminated against third class mail is for the advertising dollar. The total volume of second class mail, now I'm talking about newspapers and magazines in the United States is 2 billion, 600 million pounds of mail. Our total poundage I think you quoted there is 900 and some million pounds of mail. Now the rate on newspaper advertising is something about 3½ cents a pound. But, third class mail as you know is charged about 16 cents a pound for the heavier pieces. And, this disparity between newspapers and direct mail advertising is getting completely out of line so that we're going to be priced out of the market.

HECHLER. When you said newspaper advertising, you really meant newspaper delivery by the Post Office?

MAGINNIS. Yeah, the handling of newspapers. I'll give you an illustration of what I mean. The Wall Street Journal, now we're all familiar with that, is a five ounce newspaper. Now it gets red tag, first class han-

ding. It's on my desk every morning. It weighs five ounces and it only pays 1 cent to be handled by the Post Office. Now our piece of mail, of course, takes 2½ cents to be handled at the moment. It's much lighter. It may weigh only an eighth of an ounce actually. And, of course, it may take a week to get there. So I say that newspapers get a tremendous break over direct mail advertising.

MODERATOR. Are they still going to get it? HECHLER. Well, no not nearly as much. The bill raises, of course, the rates on newspapers. I might add that there have been a number of newspapers—for example the Charleston, West Virginia Gazette has come out very strongly not only against junk mail but in favor of raising postage rates for newspapers and magazines. Here also I have an editorial from the Denver Post that comes out very strongly on raising second class rates on newspapers. Steve, I wonder if I could comment for . . .

MODERATOR. Wait a minute, before you do. Remember what you wanted to say. I want to ask a question.

HECHLER. Alright.

MODERATOR. I've seen these page ads and these ads say that all these magazines are going to go out of business. Do you think they will, Ken?

HECHLER. Well, I don't know. It seems to me here again that under the free enterprise system that we are operating under that if a magazine, if a third class mail user or if a business can't make its cost it shouldn't be the responsibility of the government to step in and subsidize it. And, some of them may, like *Flair Magazine* may go out of business because they aren't worth staying in business. The *Underwear Daily*, I think that they went out of business, too.

MODERATOR. Well, they're throwing the first amendment at you. Something about freedom of speech and the people won't be informed if you throw this amendment through and all sorts of things.

HECHLER. Well, all I can say on that, Steve, is that the second class rates are about 50% of cost. Now they've been raised up to 50%. I'd like to make a point here on the cost differential. In the testimony that Postmaster General Day gave before the House Post Office Committee last year, speaking about this 3½ cent rate which I got through with my amendment, he said: "The proposed 3½ cent minimum rate for third class bulk mail represents a discount of at least 30% below the proposed first class rate. We believe the rates proposed adequately reflect the value of service differences for the two mail classes." So, I think that takes care of the argument, Harry, which you so ably presented about the differences in handling of premium first class mail and the handling of third class mail.

MAGINNIS. As you so well know, though doctor he abandoned this particular rate bill in favor of another one and reduced the rates all along the line because the question of public policy you know arose in the Committee and the Committee voted overwhelmingly to set aside about 250-million dollars not to be charged to the business users of the mail. Postmaster General Summerfield had felt that this amount shouldn't be any more than 52-million dollars but this issue once and for all has been resolved and the Democrats promised to resolve it and they have resolved it. So that Mr. Day when he presented his bill on the House floor on January 23, had a different bill than the one you're talking about. Even he was convinced by our arguments.

MODERATOR. Gentlemen. Let me do a commercial here, and then I would like to get a few phone calls and then I think it might be fun Ken to take a poll tonight to see if people are with you and your amendment. Not here no, not here. You want to watch something? How many Republicans are here tonight? Put up your hands. Alright

what chance have you got, you're a Democrat.

HECHLER. Tell them how many Republicans.

MODERATOR. You tell them. You took a poll.

HECHLER. Oh, I didn't see. I'm very near-sighted. But tell the listeners.

MODERATOR. How many Democrats. About what? No they're not. They're more Republicans. Alright let's take a phone call or two. Make your questions brief and to the point please. Don't tell me stories. I don't want to hear how you use your wastebasket. I just want a question for either Mr. Hechler or Mr. Maginnis. Black Saddle. Hello. Are you against junk mail? Was that a question or . . . unsolicited books that they want you to pay for. Well, that's not what we're talking about. I don't know what to do. You don't have to . . . I say throw them in the wastebasket and no body . . . what do they have to prove? I know the law. They have to prove that you opened and read it before you have to pay them. They won't come into your house and prove that. Right? Thank you. If they want the book back, you can charge them storage. I know that. Alright no body wants to ask questions? The phone number is STerling 3-0466, STerling 3-0467. We'll keep the phones open for a minute or so. Any question you might want to ask from Doctor Hechler who is a Congressman and Mr. Maginnis. Black Saddle. You're against Mr. Hechler. Well, yes. Alright well what we're trying to do is get questions. No, we'll take a poll later. Black Saddle. Are college catalogues and that kind of thing third class mail? Well, third class mail, I don't like to make Harry mad. He can kill me tonight for saying junk mail. I don't want to say it. Are college catalogues considered third class mail?

MAGINNIS. Yes they're third class mail.

HECHLER. Non-profit is not covered under my amendment.

MODERATOR. Alright they're not covered under the amendment because they're non-profit but they are third class mail. Black Saddle. Right. Does the FTC have control over the type of advertising put through the mail on these things? Do you know, Ken?

HECHLER. I don't know the answer on that.

MAGINNIS. I'd like to give the answer on that, Steve, because I think I'm going to begin to make a point of it. The most honest type of advertising is in direct mail for one specific reason.

MODERATOR. Using the United States mail.

MAGINNIS. If you lie you are subject to the fraud statutes of the Post Office Department and you can go to jail. Now in no other form of advertising is this true. In radio and newspapers the FTC may give you a slap on the wrist and so forth but you better not lie in direct mail advertising or somebody is going to jail. And, they are going to jail at the moment in various sections of the country.

HECHLER. I think that's very healthy. I'm glad that Harry brought that point out. I'm not against this type of mail, all I'm asking is that it pay its way.

MODERATOR. Black Saddle. Yeah. You want me to ask Harry Maginnis what did he do? Oh, that's a stupid question. What does he do with the third class mail he gets at home? He reads it. Hello. Everybody will pull that on you. What do you do? Where do you live? Yes mam. Alright. How are housewives supposed to do their shopping when they don't get catalogues?

HECHLER. Well, I suppose that every newspaper has very good ads and there are good ads over the radio and I suppose that's one way you can do your shopping. Also, you can go around and look personally.

MODERATOR. She has children she has to take care of, she says. Hello. It's not your fault, Ken. Hello. You want to know something about Mr. Hechler? He's a nice fellow. Wait a minute you're getting all confused

now. Either that or I don't understand you. Start again. Addressing firms who address these third class mails, yes, they put men on the street to hand deliver some of them. So the rate will be less. In other words, they don't use the Post Office. Well, then it has nothing to do with this discussion. People hand, it has nothing to do with the discussion, mam. Thank you.

MAGINNIS. I think it does, Steve. I'd like to . . .

MODERATOR. Alright.

MAGINNIS. Our main opponent in this city is the Scripps-Howard Newspaper, The Washington Daily News. They deliver circulars of Safeway and the other food chains door to door for \$15 a thousand. Now naturally we have to pay \$25 dollars a thousand in postage. They'd like to see the rate go up further so they'll have all the circular business.

MODERATOR. Pretty strong.

HECHLER. Well, I still don't think the government should subsidize it.

MODERATOR. Black Saddle. How about two or three standard sized envelopes? What do you mean? Christmas cards are all different sizes. Well what about it? Wouldn't it be better if there were only two or three standard sizes? I think they would be . . . Let's take a poll. You've heard Mr. Maginnis, you've heard Doctor Hechler. The question is, "Are you for raising the rate on third class mail from 2½ to 3½ cents?" You've heard the arguments for and against. You've heard the subsidy involved. You've heard the wastebasket involved. You've heard the advertising advantages involved. The lady who doesn't want to read to children, you heard three or four different strong arguments in each case. We'd like to have a poll. Are you for raising the rate of third class mail from 2½ cents to 3½ cents? It's passed the House of Representatives. It's going to the Senate and Harry's just begun to fight. Just say yes or no. Are you for raising the rates? Ready? Hello. Yes. Hello. No. Tell you what, folks, when we take these polls the phones are open. You may call STerling 3-0466, STerling 3-0467 as fast as you can dial, you dial. The phones are open. Just say yes or no and we take your answer and hang up immediately. Hello. Yes. Are you for raising the rates from 2½ cents of third class mail to 3½? Hello. No. Dial as fast as you can folks. The phones are open. Hello. No. Hello. No. What have you got your brother out there? Hello. Yes. Hello. Yes. Hello. Yes. Black Saddle. Yes. Mostly women were saying no but that was a man. Black Saddle. Yes. Another man, yes. STerling 3-0466. Hello. Here is a man who can't make up his mind he calls me up ahahahah. He likes to dial the phone. Hello. Yes. Are you for raising the rates? Hello. Yes. I hope somebody's out listening for your sake. Hello. Yes. Oh you were doing alright there for a while. Black Saddle. No. Black Saddle. Yes. Hello. No. How many you got, Stan? Seventeen. We need three more. STerling 3-0466. Hello. No. She was pretty mad. That was Mrs. Maginnis. Hello. No. Hello. Yes. It was pretty close. Wasn't it? Twelve to eight.

You won it, Ken. Twelve to eight. Pretty close, though. You want to make a parting speech for thirty seconds, Harry?

MAGINNIS. Oh, I'd like to just say that we live in a free enterprise capitalistic system. Mr. Kennedy wants to increase the gross national product, my great industry generates 20 billion in sales annually. We'd like to continue that great job and keep people employed and selling the goods and products of American labor if we're permitted to do so.

MODERATOR. Ken?

HECHLER. We live in a free enterprise capitalistic system, therefore, I believe that third class mail users should pay their own way without U.S. government subsidy. And if

they generate 20 billion in sales annually they can afford to pay higher rates.

MODERATOR. There you have it ladies and gentlemen. Two brilliant men. We are grateful to both of them for coming to our microphones tonight. Doctor Ken Hechler, Representative from West Virginia and Mr. Harry J. Maginnis, Executive Manager, Associated Third Class Mail Users. Big round of applause. I tell you. I just would like to say this before we leave. When Harry called and asked if we would invite Congressman Hechler, I knew he was a strong, powerful man but I didn't think he'd come. Because he's still a Congressman, Harry and you're still a lobbyist. And, I think Ken deserves a lot of credit. I'm very grateful Harry, and Ken and I think it's wonderful for you to be here. Thank you for listening, good night.

TEXT OF RADIO DEBATE BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVE KEN HECHLER, DEMOCRAT, WEST VIRGINIA, AND HARRY J. MAGINNIS, PRESIDENT, ASSOCIATED THIRD CLASS-MAIL USERS

ALLISON. Our guests at the WWDC microphones—two dear and old friends who've been at sort of different ends of the pole for a long time—Mr. Harry J. Maginnis, President of Associated Third Class Mail Users; and Representative Ken Hechler, Democrat of West Virginia.

Hey, the Senator from your state just got a big job, Ken, didn't he?

HECHLER. Yes, Senator Robert C. Byrd is Number 3 man in the United States Senate now.

ALLISON. All right. Harry Maginnis, what is the Associated Third Class Mail Users?

MAGINNIS. We're a trade association, Steve, of direct mail users, essentially using bulk third class mail. We're 800 in number and we include such organizations as Time, Incorporated, Sears Roebuck, Spiegel, Incorporated, the 2700 retail merchants in America, Billy Graham's evangelistic association, 22 Catholic Charities . . . many, many organizations . . . all of whom use the printed word to sell and distribute the goods and products they produce . . . in accordance with the free-enterprise, capitalistic system.

ALLISON. I want to make a fast little speech and then we'll get going with our discussion.

Firstly, let me say, folks, I should be against third class mail because they are a form of advertising which cuts into my revenue. However, I'm against it. I'm against it for many, many reasons. You've read many newspaper articles, you've heard people on the air . . . television . . . going on and on and on about the so-called "junk" mail. "I don't like this in my box!" "Why are they insisting?" . . . and on and on . . . so I bumped into Bill Gold who is obviously not too friendly with your association.

MAGINNIS. He's one of our members, Steve . . . Newsweek magazine. (Laughter.) A great user of third class mail . . . create its great circulation . . . a fine magazine . . . so Gold is an employee of that . . .

ALLISON. That's all right. He's still got the right—

MAGINNIS. He's entitled—

ALLISON. Right. Like I can blast away at radio and television—

MAGINNIS. That's right.

ALLISON. I don't remember the last time I did, but anyway . . . I said to Bill: "Look—the crux of the whole matter, Bill, is . . . if the people didn't want it, the mailers wouldn't use it. Obviously it is paying off. What's all the beef?" That's all I want to say. Now, Congressman Hechler, you sit on a Committee whose job it is to check this—don't you?

HECHLER. No, I do not. I just tried to represent the average housewives, the consumers, and people whose mailboxes are jammed with things that they don't read, don't want, and go into the wastebasket.

I want to say, though, I'm not against junk mail. I merely feel that junk mail should pay its way—as all other advertising. The advertisers who advertise on your program pay 100 percent of the cost of that advertising. But the third class mailers don't pay that cost and we taxpayers have to pay part of it—for things that we didn't ask for, for things that we don't want when we get them, and things that go into the wastebasket when we receive them.

ALLISON. Now, you made two or three statements, Ken, but one I want to pick up and then Harry, I'm sure, has an answer. . .

If they didn't want it, if they don't use it, if it goes in the mailbox economically . . . and by the way, folks, I don't know whether you know this but Mr. Hechler is (or was) a professor of economics and political science. Economically, Ken wouldn't this be silly for the people who pay for this—it costs them money—to send it?

HECHLER. Well, obviously, they get some results and they should pay for the results. They get results and they have such a thriving industry which can afford to pay Mr. Maginnis very well. . . Harry, I think, is well paid and I think he deserves it, too.

The mere fact they can build up an industry that generates many jobs and billions of dollars of revenue, I think, indicates that they ought to be able to pay the cost of mailing also. There's a \$1.2 billion-dollar deficit in the Post Office Department every year. We, the people who mail First Class and Air Mail letters, bear the cost of this advertising. So I think it's bad enough to be irritated but worse to have to pay for being irritated.

ALLISON. Go ahead, Harry.

MAGINNIS. Well, Steve, I'd like to discuss a little bit about third class mail. It was created at the request of the Post Office Department by the Congress of the United States in 1928. The Post Office Department consists of 700,000 employees, one of the largest businesses in the world. And like many other businesses, it must have a volume of mail to keep these very valuable employees properly occupied.

Bulk third class mail is a deferred category of mail which does not enjoy the preferment that first-class enjoys. It is only handled in slack periods when there's nothing else to do by the postal clerks; it is delivered only when all other categories of mail are out of the way; it must be pre-sorted by the mailer in advance in accordance with ZIP Code sequence, which has just been introduced on a mandatory basis.

The main expenses in the Post Office Department are the manual handling of the mail. Now, we're all familiar—you and your listeners—with what happens to a first-class letter. One puts a five-cent stamp on it and drops it in a suburban mailbox, a two-ton truck comes and picks it up, hauls it down to the Post Office Department where the stamp must be cancelled, it must be put in the pigeonhole, must be put on the fastest form of transportation . . . and when it gets to where it's going, it receives priority in treatment.

Third-class mail is not quite like that. It doesn't use stamps, no cancellation required—it's all presorted down in the carrier route . . .

ALLISON. You have broken down how much it actually costs the Post Office to send a third-class piece of mail, Harry?

MAGINNIS. Well, when one gets into statistics, Steve, I would prefer that Congressman Hechler amend his bill. He has a bill I might say in the Congress—introduced it earlier in the Session—H.R. 99—which would raise the individual piece rate on third-class mail.

Now, most of your listeners will recognize this as the Christmas card with the flap in.

He would make this particular piece of mail 5 cents, which is, of course, the same as first-class mail—so nobody would then go

third-class mail. Naturally, they'd go to first-class.

He would make the bulk rate $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents. Now, if he makes it $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents—and you require the mailer to do all of the presorting cost which is very expensive—then he will go to first-class mail . . . he has an alternative.

ALLISON. Wait a minute—hold on a minute, Harry—you're talking too long . . . get this thing started . . . off the ground. You see, what you're doing, Harry Maginnis . . . you're so close to it, you're saying these things so fast I'm not following you.

Now, what is the cost of third-class mail? Half a cent? What is the cost?

MAGINNIS. Well, I'm trying to describe . . . nobody really knows the cost of the thing. (Both talk at once.) We pay $2\frac{3}{4}$ ths cents minimum per piece vis-a-vis 5 cents for first-class mail.

ALLISON. My goodness! They're paying about 3 cents a letter . . . the post fella only handles it when he's got nothing else to do . . . see, I'm just bringing out what Harry said in my language—then we're going to ask you to answer point-by-point, if you don't mind. All right.

Number One, the guy handles it when he's got nothing else to do; Number Two, the sender has to package it—saving them a lot of work in the Post Office. So it seems to me we should let them send the third-class mail for a penny and a half—not $2\frac{3}{4}$ ths . . . charging them too much!

Now! Do you have statistics to prove that what Harry says is wrong, or what I just outlined or paraphrased he said is wrong?

HECHLER. I would like to comment on it in this way. In the first place, third-class mail pays about 60 percent of the cost. In the second place, I think Harry's argument about only being handled in the slack periods was true when third-class mail first went in in the 1928-1930 period, because at that time it only constituted about 1 out of 8 pieces. But since that time third-class mail has increased 250 percent in volume—while all the other mail has only increased 80 percent.

Also the number of employees—and the manhours worked in the Post Office—increased over this period.

If the postal work force had remained stable—the number of hours worked and the volume the same—why, I would say his argument is very good. But the number of employees has gone up actually in order to handle this third-class mail . . .

ALLISON. He says you're wrong, then, Harry . . . he says that they're not only doing it in slack periods . . . so much third-class mail they have to do . . . work on it when they could be working on first-class . . . true or false?

MAGINNIS. Well, the facts are that it does get severely-deferred handling . . . and the best way to illustrate that . . . I have 800 members and I send out a bulletin quite regularly to these members. I have the choice of sending it third-class or first-class mail . . . I can enjoy the lower rate. However, never have I used the third-class privilege except on one occasion when it took 28 days to get to Chicago, 14 days to New York, and the West Coast hasn't received some of them yet. (Laughter.)

So I go first-class mail because I'm willing to pay the premium for the preferred handling which it gets.

But the way best to describe whether it does or doesn't pay its way in the postal service is to ask this question: The revenue from third-class mail at the moment is \$700 million annually. Now if it's no good—as the Congressman says—and nobody reads it and everybody throws it away, then let's eliminate it.

ALLISON. Now don't go to the extreme with my old buddy Ken Hechler of West Virginia . . . you went to the extreme—he didn't say that!

MAGINNIS. I think he said nobody read it, everybody was disturbed with it, everybody threw it away.

HECHLER. I said that PORTION of third-class mail is junk mail which people don't read.

ALLISON. What people? Do you want to put a percentage on it, Ken?

HECHLER. Well, all right. I don't think it's possible to put a percentage on it . . .

ALLISON. Well, guess—

HECHLER. Except I can give an educated guess that perhaps 50 percent of the people don't want a lot of the mail that they receive.

ALLISON. You see, I called him on that, Harry. Now he's saying "50 percent," which means that your people decided that 50 percent of the people reading it was enough to pay them.

MAGINNIS. Well, let's assume this, Steve. Let's assume that you have 250,000 listeners on this station . . . you just had one of your famous ads on Willy Wilson (with whom I deal very effectively, incidentally).

ALLISON. You do—

MAGINNIS. I'm sure that if out of that 250,000 people—tomorrow—Willy Wilson sold 8 color TV sets, he would have paid his fee to you well. However, if you took the percentage response of 8 television sets in relation to 250,000 listeners, it would be an infinitesimal decimal.

HECHLER. Steve, did you hear about the fellow who had been receiving mail marked "Occupant" for many years and he began to receive mail with "Occupant" as return address—it really stopped him! But seriously, when mail is received marked "Occupant"—why, my tendency is to say: There are people that live here—not "Occupant!"

ALLISON. Would you say, Ken, in all your experience as a Congressman that only the "agin its" write? Why won't you get a letter from nice little old people who have nothing to do all day and look forward to this third-class mail and read it?

HECHLER. I have a whole batch of letters from nice people all over the country that say: I like your bill. I think it's great. Hurray! . . . at last we've got somebody who's standing up and fighting for the average person.

ALLISON. What's their beef? They're just mean people, Ken . . . I don't care, they're just mean people. I don't want to sound like I'm taking Harry's part here, but it seems to me they're mean people. You don't want to throw it in the basket—what difference does it make?

And some little old people, lonely people who want to read it, I like 'em, I read 'em all . . . colorful little things.

MAGINNIS. Do you mind, Steve, if I comment on that. I had a wonderful experience working for Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio, the big state of Ohio . . . and then for Senator Edward Martin of Pennsylvania . . . another quite populous state.

ALLISON. Didn't know he was such a . . . Ken, listen who he worked for.

MAGINNIS. Well, in any event, I suppose during that time, Steve, we received fully one million letters from the WCTU, from the drives of one sort or another, saying: Please eliminate booze around Army camps, let's truncate it here . . . let's do away with it all. In all the years I worked on Capitol Hill I can't recall one letter from a guy who said "Let's keep cocktails . . ." and so forth. Now if you legislated according to your mail we'd have prohibition in the United States today. And this is true of many issues.

We were discussing at dinner tonight—some of our people—the kinds of bills that we would put in a hopper if we only had two years to serve in Congress. If you want to stir up some difficulty—

ALLISON. What would you do with the third-class . . . would you do the thing I suggested before—a penny and a half a piece of mail?

MAGINNIS. Oh, I'd be for a reduction of it, but I do agree with the Congressman . . . the cost recovery traditionally since 1928 when the differential pricing theory was adopted by the Congress . . . it's been about 75 percent. It's now below that cost and should be raised, but his bill, of course, would raise it up to something like 95 percent.

ALLISON. Let me ask you a question, Ken. What do we recover from first-class mail?

HECHLER. It's a little over 100 percent.

ALLISON. Wow! You mean we make money on first-class?

HECHLER. Yes, we make money on first-class.

ALLISON. Well, then, you haven't got much of a leg to stand on, Harry.

MAGINNIS. Well, this is a statement which won't stand the light of investigation. Accountants cannot figure out what dollar value to put on the preferential handling which both airmail and first-class mail receive. And traditionally it's paid anywhere from 108 percent to 141 percent of its way in the postal service. It pays a premium for the premium handling. And of course the third-class gets a discount of 25 percent because of the slow handling . . . but the accountants can't put a value on this deferment of handling. But 75 percent—I would agree with the Congressman—there is a need for a rate increase and I would go along with it . . . but not to the extent he—

HECHLER. I'd just like to answer that. Harry mentioned the accountants can't figure it out. I'm taking official Post Office Department figures that have indicated first-class pay more than 100 percent and third-class pays only about 60 percent of its way. I'm not arguing with any accountants or how they do their computing. I'm simply taking the official, objective figures of the Post Office Department itself.

ALLISON. Ken, now you're hitting me where my pocketbook is . . . I'm on your side. I'm not on your side when you tell me people are screaming they don't want it—they can go to blazes—they hate everybody, so I'm tired of people like that—they're "aginners"—they hate everybody, so I'm not with them. But I am with you when you say that first-class mail (and Harry agrees) at least it pays for itself and a little more, Harry. Why should third-class mail not pay for itself, Harry?

MAGINNIS. Well, let's take his own figure here. You will know from the Budget message that the total deficit in the coming fiscal year is \$1.2 billion in the postal services . . . right, Congressman?

HECHLER. That is correct, Harry.

MAGINNIS. Let's assume that you double the rate on third-class mail—that would raise \$700 million more, which is about \$500 million short of the Department balancing its budget. But it's obvious that the only place revenue can be gained is both from airmail and from first-class mail.

HECHLER. I would also raise second-class rates. I think there are many newspapers and magazines that get away with murder—and I think that we ought to raise those rates, Harry, in order to—

MAGINNIS. Well, I'll be glad to draft a bill for you, sir, and have you put it in the hopper . . . (laughter)

ALLISON. For them—

MAGINNIS. Yes, for them! Very happy to do that! (laughter)

HECHLER. Incidentally, I've gotten some very powerful support from many members of Congress, including committee chairmen in Congress, who won't let me use their names because they don't want the Post Office Committee to think their committee is interfering with their jurisdiction. . . . But I can assure you that the sentiment in Congress and in the nation is even stronger than within the Post Office Committee—in favor of a raise in third-class rates.

ALLISON. Gentlemen, we're going to have

to ask you to wait here while we have news. You folks want to get in on the conversation—we'll take some phone calls later. You see how I fix it so everybody hates me! First I was on Harry's side—now I'm on Ken's side . . . I'm on everybody's side—I'm just mean! (We're pausing for news.)

ALLISON. Our guests at WWDG microphones—Mr. Harry J. Maginnis, President, Associated Third Class Mail Users . . . and Representative Ken Hechler, Democrat of West Virginia. The gentlemen are discussing the need for a bill presented by Mr. Hechler which would raise the cost of third-class mail to the users.

What is that, Ken? (pointing to newspaper displayed by Congressman Hechler.)

HECHLER. This is a full-page ad which was run in the Parkersburg, West Virginia newspapers by an advertiser who uses third-class mail and objected to my bill. He ran this ad with the headline: "He Wants to Kill the Goose That Lays the Golden Egg?" And it attacks my stand on junk mail and my desire to raise rates on third-class mail.

ALLISON. In your state, Ken?

HECHLER. It seems to me if he can pay the cost of a full-page ad like that, he ought to be able to afford a few cents more on his mailings.

ALLISON. Does he take that off his income tax?

HECHLER. Now this is another interesting point. When you mail a first-class letter, you can't take that off your income tax, but when you do bulk-rate mailing by third-class, you not only get subsidized on the rate but you can also charge it off on your income tax as advertising.

ALLISON. Ken, are you saying to me that if a company decides to send out circulars in first-class envelopes they can't take it off their income tax?

HECHLER. No. I'm saying that when you send personal letters first class, you can't charge them off your income tax.

ALLISON. Oh, that's different. But advertising is a difference.

HECHLER. Right.

ALLISON. If you're going to advertise you can take it off your income tax . . . if you send it Airmail-Special Delivery, you can take it off your income tax if it's advertising—

HECHLER. Oh, yes.

ALLISON. Oh, you're a cutie! (Laughter.) But you should know better than to pull that on me!

HECHLER. Yes, but there's a double subsidy there . . .

ALLISON. No! (Laughter.) Come on, Ken . . . tried to pull one through the old . . . (Drowned out by laughter.) See what he did to his old friend, Harry? Watch him! All right, gentlemen . . . now . . . let me find out something. Where did this junk mail bit come from—who started that one? You'd like to find the guy, wouldn't you, Harry?

MAGINNIS. I have a quote here. Congressman Hechler wrote to his colleagues asking for support of his bill and he mentioned this statement in his letter to 434 other House members on January 13th: "Housewives, businessmen, mail carriers and street sweepers, not to mention the advocates of beautification . . . support my efforts to do something about junk mail or nuisance mail." He uses these phrases—"nuisance" mail and "junk" mail.

ALLISON. He didn't originate it—

MAGINNIS. He didn't originate it. But I'm going to quote from some experts. This is a reprint from the *Union Postal Clerk* . . . these are the clerks who handle the mail. Now if anybody is disturbed by it they would be. (I'll quote from the carriers a little later.) And they say this: "It's time somebody set things straight, for the fact is that bulk-rate mail is not junk mail. This is strictly a propaganda phrase coined to dirty-up an area of promotional enterprise in the endless competition for the advertising dol-

lar. The press figures that if it can put the kibosh on direct-mail solicitation, then the millions of dollars now spent for postage and printing will have to be spent in their own advertising medium. This is a dollars-and-cents issue—not a fight over principles."

Now this is it. Now, what Congressman Hechler hasn't pointed out . . . the subsidy on second-class mail is the longest in duration, the greatest in dollars, and the second-class newspapers only recover 25 percent of their costs.

Now, the facts are that on direct-mail advertising, which is third-class mail and much first-class mail, there's \$2.4 billion dollars spent on this type of advertising. It sells \$40 billion dollars' worth of goods and services—much of it coming from West Virginia, I might point out.

Now the press would like to capture this \$2.4 billion—same as you would like to capture some of the money for your own programs here possibly.

ALLISON. Not possibly—probably. (Laughter.) Positively!

MAGINNIS. But you had here . . . you just had an ad on the Grand Bahamas. Now you promised those people—you write into me and I'll send you a beautiful circular which would go third-class mail, full color, full pictures, all about prices and so forth . . . and all advertising ties in with the other. General Motors certainly uses radio, TV, magazines, newspapers . . . and a tremendous volume of third-class mail.

Now the point about the Post Office is that everybody's concerned about its deficit. However, for all the thousands spent on this agency of the government, millions are returned. It is estimated that trillions of dollars of commerce are transacted daily through—

ALLISON. Establishment, Harry. Now listen to this one. When I get one of these pieces of mail, the reply is usually Airmail.

MAGINNIS. That's right—and we pay that fee . . . we pay the first-class fee on the reply card.

ALLISON. You forgot that one. All right, Ken, what have you got to say about these things that Harry just said?

HECHLER. In answer to Number 1 . . . Harry was talking about the postal clerks and the carriers. I've received a lot of letters myself from rural carriers who have to carry this stuff around and who frequently have to clean up when much of it is dumped around the mail boxes by those who don't want it. They have indicated quite strongly that they are not in favor of bulk mail that doesn't pay its way, and it seems to me that a letter carrier also is not in the same category, Harry, as the clerk with free time. The carrier has a certain amount of miles to cover on his route anyway and the bigger the load he gets with bulk mail the tougher job it is. Many of these people have objected very strongly to the fact that this is subsidized mail.

MAGINNIS. I hesitate—in answer to that—Steve, to get in this particular argument because I know what I'm about to say is going to be very, very unpopular in certain areas. But we know as a fact, we who have been in politics for long, the biggest political plum in the world is the rural carrier. There are always 300 applicants for this particular job and he's the first guy off the tee at the Country Club at noontime.

Now when there is "occupant" mail and he has to stop at every box—because he has a piece for every box—he resents it very much. He's got to stop there . . . he gets paid 10 cents, 12 cents a mile—whatever it is . . .

Now the rural carriers have even resisted the Department buying a fleet of cars for them. They figure they can go to the big motor companies and buy them a right-hand drive where they can put it in the boxes . . . they own their own cars . . . and they want to keep it that way.

I'm all for the rural carriers, they're a fine group . . . I haven't heard them say officially they're against third-class mail. But if the Congressman says they are, I'd like to see something, because at one time they did say so and we jumped on them a little bit in the Congressional arena.

However, the city carriers consist of 168,000 . . . represented by Jerome Keating here in Washington . . . and Jimmy Rademacher the Vice President . . . and here's what they say: (In their January issue of the Postal Record) . . .

"If there were no third-class mail, the Post Office Department could eliminate about 1/4th of its clerical employees and about 1/5th of its letter carriers. During the great Depression third-class mail dwindled away to a whisper of its former self because merchants didn't have the money to advertise and customers didn't have the money to respond to advertisements. The result was massive cuts in the employee force."

And then later on he says: "The ironical thing about third-class mail is that those who attack it the most are among those who use it the most. When the magazines and newspapers who most loudly declaim against junk mail embark on a circulation promotion program, they use third-class mail . . . the very same sort of mail their editorialists cry as being useless and an unnecessary burden on the postal service." That's the letter carrier speaking officially.

HECHLER. I'd just like to point out that among other newspapers the *Charleston West Virginia Gazette* has indicated that it is not only in favor of higher rates for third-class but for second-class also.

ALLISON. Let me say this . . . you nice ladies and gentlemen out there—you want to get in on this. Go ahead—but no speeches. If you want to ask a question these tremendous men we have here—don't want to waste time listening to your stories—just ask questions.

Now Ken Hechler of West Virginia—and Harry Maginnis. Our Phone number is District 7-6260.

HECHLER. I have a great little item from the *San Bernardino* newspaper. A columnist wrote a memo to the postman: "No one named 'occupant' resides at this address. Please stop leaving his mail. I live here. I with a name . . . here I eat, sleep, read, love and sometimes get tears in my throat when the TV writer pulls the right plug. So . . . 'occupant?' I would as soon answer to a number or admit that perforations on an IBM card can represent my name. Keep them, Mr. Postman, only people live here."

ALLISON. That's sad.

HECHLER. Doesn't that bring tears to your eyes, Steve?

ALLISON. Reminds me of a couple of poets they used to have on the front pages 30 and 40 years ago. Oh, I'm cryin' thinkin' of it!

MAGINNIS. Let me talk a little about "occupant" mail, Steve. The reason that they have occupant mail is selling products generally that appeal to everybody, whether it be soap or razor blades or some item that—

ALLISON. Discount coupons—

MAGINNIS. Discount coupons. Now if it's said that they don't reply to this . . . we know that the great soap companies, Procter & Gamble and Lever Brothers, have to redeem the coupons and they know exactly to the 10th decimal point how many are turned in by the grocers who redeem them. And I can assure you the percentage figure is very, very high.

ALLISON. Unless the grocer goes to the barrel and pulls them out and redeems them.

MAGINNIS. I should like to also point out the effectiveness of occupant mail . . . with John Kennedy when he was running for the Presidency of the United States . . . blanketed all of those states with occupant mail in which he had primary fights . . . and it proved to be a very effective weapon. He

wanted to get one piece of mail in every household.

HECHLER. Maybe that's why he only won by one-half of 1 percent.

MAGINNIS. Except in West Virginia it was 60-40 against Hubert Humphrey. (All talk at once.) I know we had that argument the last time and Nixon was sorry he didn't use occupant mail.

ALLISON. If they're so mad at it, Ken, why do they vote for the guy who sent it?

HECHLER. Well, I'm just simply pointing out that he was using it in certain concentrated areas . . .

ALLISON. How about congressmen? Did they use it?

HECHLER. Well, I personally don't use it. I pointed out, I think, on our last program a few years ago that I put a 5 cent, first-class stamp on all political mailing that I send out.

ALLISON. Well, we won't keep you from your seat. But Harry, remember an argument you brought up on the program last time . . .

HECHLER. The program was on February 6, 1962 . . . I remember that date because that's my mother's birthday. But you brought up the argument that if you raised the cost too high it would cut down the volume and it would thereby hurt the business. I'm interested that you didn't bring that argument up again this time because as the rates have gone up the volume of third-class mail has gone up tremendously. In fact, the business has gotten bigger and bigger and bigger and richer and richer and richer . . . and more and more able to afford to pay its way.

MAGINNIS. All right, I should like to comment on that because we haven't sat together since February 6, 1962 . . . but at that time your amendment had been successful on the floor of the House of Representatives to raise the minimum-piece rate 3 1/2 cents. We then went to the Senate of the United States . . . argued our case . . . and that body adopted a 3-step increase to 2 3/4ths cents . . . to 2 6/8ths cents . . . to 2 1/2ths cents. So your amendment did not prevail in the eventual end, the bill that the President signed.

Now we don't know what might have happened had the rate gone to 3 1/2 cents, but my own judgment would have been we would have lost in sales about \$10 billion and the mail would have been reduced. Certainly under your proposal to make the minimum piece rate 4 1/2 cents . . . would, in effect, eliminate third-class mail as a sales tool, in my judgment.

ALLISON. Do you think you can get your amendment through, Ken?

HECHLER. I think I can, Steve. I think that the people of this country have not really had a lobbyist for them on this issue. The third-class mail users have had a very, very effective man in Harry Maginnis. I think he's demonstrated on the program tonight by his arguments that he is effective and he's a tremendous person. The people of the country up to this point haven't really had good effective lobbyists for the people, and this is why the members of Congress must be the lobbyists. I think, this year because of the limitation of money by reason of the war in Vietnam and other squeezes, Congress is going to look for the revenue that we can get out of third-class mail, and we are going to try to make third-class mail pay its way. And so I say I think we do have a very, very good chance of passing my bill.

ALLISON. Where is your bill now?

HECHLER. It's now in the Post Office Committee . . . the Chairman of the Post Office Committee has sent it to the Bureau of the Budget for comment. And the President, as you know, is going to send up a message in a few weeks with his proposals for rate increases.

ALLISON. Do you think this will be included?

HECHLER. I'm afraid his proposals are not going to be high enough to suit me and suit

the Congress on third-class rates—from our indications. Wouldn't you say so, Harry?

MAGINNIS. Well, we're going to have hearings on a postal-rate readjustment bill of \$800 million—including all categories of mail. But I should like to say this: Ken has made a categorical statement here that nobody has been lobbying against third-class mail and attempting to get its rates increased. Let me say this:

That there is no business in the United States that has been under attack so severely by 10,000 newspapers as this particular medium.

We have no way except Mr. Allison's program and a few other places to get our story told. Now, luckily, we believe in Congress and when we get before the postal committees we have an opportunity to present our side and usually reason out—and we do get fair treatment by the Congress.

ALLISON. You're a whipping-boy, Harry, do you know that? I'm always on the unpopular side.

HECHLER. I wish we could show a Herblock cartoon on this show, Steve—do you remember that one that came out about a week ago Sunday, showing the postman bent by the burden of junk mail he was carrying?

MAGINNIS. I saw the cartoon and I wrote to Mr. Herblock and I wrote to Mr. Gold because on the same day this cartoon appeared—it showed two letter carriers with a heavy mail bag labeled "Junk Mail" and loaded down. On that same day I received from Newsweek Magazine their dues check for \$300 asking me to fight the good fight. So I wrote Mr. Herblock and I said: "You can't have it both ways. I'm not a magician. You can't hire me as a lobbyist and protect the circulation of your Newsweek Magazine. But the truth of the matter is the press never points out that the weight of second-class mail (I'm talking about newspapers and magazines) is exactly twice the weight of all third-class mail and its only pays $\frac{1}{2}$ th of the revenue that we pay.

Now these facts are never accentuated by the newspapers.

ALLISON. Ken has just accentuated them.

MAGINNIS. Yes. He didn't accent the weight nor the cost of handling.

ALLISON. Let's get a phone call—somebody wants to talk to you. All right?

Question: I'd like to ask the Congressman if it is possible in his bill that the expense of mailing would be cut down—the duplication of mailing lists. I often get 3 or 4 of the same catalog.

HECHLER. The bill would not provide for this but I think that what we ought to try to do is write into other legislation—it's not contained in my bill—an opportunity to return mail in such a way that the sender would have to pay the cost and that might discourage him from duplicating so many names on lists.

Question: And my husband has been dead four years and I've written people to take his name off their mailing lists—no results.

ALLISON. Well, because you're writing to a machine.

Question: I suppose.

ALLISON. Thank you. That reminds me, gentlemen, let me ask you—to go ahead with what the woman started. The mail is sent—and, like she said, her husband has been dead. She wants to send it back—she puts it in the mailbox and says: "Send to sender." Will it be sent back to him? Isn't third-class mail so that you don't get it back if somebody doesn't get it?

MAGINNIS. The rule on third-class mail is it does not enjoy the forwarding privileges of first-class nor may it be returned without payment of an 8-cent fee, that's what we pay to get the mail back.

ALLISON. Do you pay it, Harry?

MAGINNIS. We pay the 8-cent fee to get the piece of mail back and on it will be the notation that he's deceased or moved or . . .

HECHLER. Suppose the recipient marks "Re-

fused" on it . . . in that case the sender doesn't have to pay.

MAGINNIS. No, it is then burned or destroyed—

HECHLER. I'd like to see in line with the lady who just called—I'd like to see written into law that if you write "REFUSED" on a piece of third-class mail—the sender ought to be made to pay the postage for its return.

ALLISON. This I didn't know!

HECHLER. This might be a way to cut down on duplication.

MAGINNIS. There have been bills, I might say, which would provide that any postal patron can refuse to receive any third-class mail . . . and this kind of legislation has been seriously considered. However, when one does this, he does the following: License tags come from the state by third-class mail, so he refuses that. All his tax information from both the Federal government, the state government, all election material comes third-class mail . . . half of his Christmas cards come third-class mail . . . small packages under 16 ounces come third-class . . . so once he gives that signature "I don't want to receive any third-class mail," he's eliminating a good many things he would like to get.

ALLISON. Harry, now you're going to an extreme. He's not talking about ANY third-class . . . he takes a piece of stuff he doesn't want and he puts out a "REFUSE"—puts it in the mailbox . . . that doesn't eliminate the other third-class mail . . . it eliminates THAT piece of literature from that particular company.

MAGINNIS. I say that's a possibility, but it creates another bureau to handle this kind of thing . . . we pay for it and we're willing to pay the 8 cents to get the up-to-date address back. However, let's take the newspaper, let's take the Washington Post.

ALLISON. Hold on . . . (Time out for the commercial.) All right, before we get to the phones again . . . Congressman Hechler has a little statement he wants to make.

HECHLER. Yes, the widow who called a little while back about duplication of lists . . . reminds me I got this letter from Alton, Illinois . . . Albert A. Fosher wrote me: "Enclosed are 7 copies of a nursery catalog I received in a period of 3 days last month. Last month I received 15 or 16 of these catalogs. I wrote to the nursery company complaining about the great number of catalogs. In their reply they stated it was cheaper to send out extra catalogs than to check their mailing lists."

So a lot of this really is unwanted and I think the poor lonely persons who can read this on rainy days and get cheered up by it—I sympathize with and I don't want to stop it but I certainly think it ought to pay its way.

Question: Since the 1st of January I have received 41 pieces of junk mail and I marked each one of them "RETURN TO SENDER" and dropped them back in the mailbox. Have I violated the law?

ALLISON. What's the answer?

MAGINNIS. The answer is that the Post Office Department will destroy the mail—they'll simply throw it away.

ALLISON. Even if he says "RETURN TO SENDER?"

MAGINNIS. That's right—unless the sender agrees to pay the 8-cent postage . . . he puts on a written statement saying return requested—upon which you pay an 8-cent fee.

HECHLER. Should the taxpayers have to pay the expense of having postal employees destroy things?

MAGINNIS. Well, we get into a philosophical discussion of government. We heard the President today in his economic message . . . we're worried about General Motors laying off tens of thousands of peoples . . . we live in a free-enterprise society . . . and unless we sell the goods and products pro-

duced by American labor we're going to be in tough shape.

Now all third-class mail is a selling tool to move goods and services produced by American labor. I don't think "profit" is an ugly word. Now those of my members in the business are in it to make a profit. Now if we don't choose to live in this capitalistic society, we don't have to listen to TV and radio and read newspapers and all the forms of advertising . . . but that's what made this nation great, that's why we can support all these endeavors throughout the world and support freedom, because now we have a budget of \$135 billion and the President says to labor and he says to industry: Let's hold the line—let's not have inflation. And he puts it on a voluntary basis. Yet on the other hand, he's introducing a rate bill that will increase postal costs from 20-25 percent.

Now this is the only product that government sells—postal service. In all other areas it's not called a deficit—it's called an appropriation. I don't think the President can ask industry to hold its prices down while raising its own.

HECHLER. I'm in favor of free enterprise . . . I would think you as a former assistant of Senator Taft, a great exponent of free enterprise, would think that free competitive enterprise should be unsubsidized by the government.

I'd like to make one quick comment about the volume of third-class mail. If a steep increase in rates, Harry, does cut the volume a little, perhaps that won't be so bad. Then maybe the Post Office Department could deliver its first-class mail a little bit quicker.

ALLISON. Touché! Thank you, sir.

Question: I'd like to ask the Congressman a question. If he's so concerned about the mail paying its own way, what about all the political mail sent out by Congressmen under the frank privilege which pays nothing?

HECHLER. Well, I have indicated before that I never send political mail except with a 5-cent, first-class stamp.

Question: What about the other Congressmen?

HECHLER. I'm sure that no Congressman could legally send out strictly political mail under the frank. The frank is only for official government business.

Question: What about all these newsletters that they send out to their constituents?

HECHLER. Well, I certainly think there that when you're sending a newsletter out—it is official business because it is a means of informing the people in your District of the issues involved. It's interpreted by the Post Office Department as being official business, although I personally don't do it.

ALLISON. Tell you what let's do, gentlemen. Let me ask Mr. Maginnis and Congressman Hechler to make sort of a closing statement for a minute or a minute and a half—and then we'll take a poll. I think we took a poll last time—let's take another one for fun to see if they've changed. The poll will be . . . and you can ring the phone as fast as you can dial . . . because the phones are open . . . say "Yes" or "No" . . . are you for the Hechler Amendment which would raise the price of third-class mail? And I think Congressman Hechler would love to hear what our polls would show. All right, how about it, Ken? Do you want to make a little speech for a minute a half?

HECHLER. I'm very much in favor of raising third-class postal rates to such an extent that this class of mail will pay its way. This will cut down the postal deficit, and enable more energy to be devoted toward speedier delivery of first-class mail. Under our free enterprise system an advertiser pays the full cost of an advertisement in the newspaper or radio or over television; therefore, why should he be subsidized when he makes his advertising through the mail? I'm in favor

of advertising, I'm not against banning third-class mail, I merely feel it should pay its way.

ALLISON. All right, Harry—a minute and a half.

MAGINNIS. The practical effect of the Hechler Amendment would be to eliminate third-class mail by punitive rates. If the Congressman were sincere about eliminating the postal deficit he would attack the sacred cow of the Postal Service by urging an increase in second-class rates which are newspapers. This he has not done in his bill. He has not covered increases in other categories of mail such as educational material—consisting of books. He does—very fairly, I must admit—raise the non-profit rate to churches and charities and others by 100 percent. I think he'll get a lot of opposition to this.

I would like to repeat again that the newspapers would like to recapture for themselves the advertising dollars spent on direct-mail advertising. We, however, feel that since we sell over \$40 billion in goods and services and have employment from 4 to 5 million people in America—that we are performing a service in this capitalistic society. We don't regard "profit" as an ugly word . . . we do regret that there are duplications, it's expensive . . . and we feel that our mail is honest.

I would make only one final point. Direct-mail advertising is the only type of advertising where if you lie or cheat you can actually go to jail—any other forms of advertising get a pat on the wrist. Whatever you read in the mail, you can trust—because the 1900 postal inspectors waiting to swoop down on you . . .

I agree with Congressman Hechler there's a need for a rate increase. It only remains to decide what a fair increase is. I think his increase is too much—we'll argue it out in the Congressional arena before the postal committees and I think Congress will be fair with us.

ALLISON. All right, that's good. I'll tell you . . . Oh, folks. The phone number: District 7-6260. Let's make the question clear and easier: Are you for third-class mail? (Discussion.) All right. Are you for raising the price of third-class mail? Are you for raising the price of third-class mail?

MAGINNIS. To what degree, though, Steve? We're arguing about the degree—

ALLISON. All right, let's make a degree. Go ahead—how much do you want to raise it?

MAGINNIS. Well, I would raise it so it will cover the cost of traditionally as recovered of 75 percent of its way . . . he wants to make it 95 percent of its way.

ALLISON. How are you going to take a poll? (Discussion.) Let's use this question for the poll: Are you in favor of a steep increase in rates for third-class mail? Okay? Answer "Yes" or "No" . . . as soon as you say "Yes" or "No" I'm going to hang up because we want the phones to be open. District 7-6260.

Hello.

Question. Steve Allison?

ALLISON. Just say "Yes" or "No" . . .

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. All right, keep dialing as fast as you can. While they're getting to the phone—because we're going to talk about home rule a little later . . . Ken, you're with us again, aren't you?

HECHLER. Yes, sir, I always am, Steve.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. Yes, Steve.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. You're in trouble, Harry! Hello.

Question. No.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. I vote "Yes."

ALLISON. Oh, my! Harry, why didn't you rig this thing! Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Well, you got another one there, Harry. Isn't that interesting—the male "No." Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Oh, my. And these good people would scream and yell if they stopped getting their mail. Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. Yes!

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. No.

ALLISON. Isn't that funny? The males vote "No."

Question. (Both a man and a woman say "Yes" at the same time.)

ALLISON. Well, she had him by the hand . . . (Laughter) She had an arm lock on that poor fella? Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Well, poll away—Help.

Question. No.

ALLISON. Keep dialing—

Question. Maybe! (laughter.)

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Well, that guy had plenty of guts. He wanted to really let us know—Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Hello . . . our phone number is District 7-6260 . . .

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. District 7-6260 . . . how many do we have . . . twenty to four? All right, let's see if we can get 80 calls—Okay? Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. Yes.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. No.

ALLISON. You're not doing too good, Harry—

MAGINNIS. Oh, it's always the man who has to meet the payroll . . . bring home the bacon . . . it's the women who are against it evidently—

ALLISON. Hello.

Question. No.

ALLISON. Hello.

Question: Yes

ALLISON. Hello

Question: Yes

ALLISON. That's 30? You blew it, Harry. Twenty-four to 6 . . . No, 23 to 7 . . . 6 . . . isn't that sad. One "maybe" . . . I would have voted for you, Harry! Well, that's it . . .

HECHLER. There was one fellow, though, I think the lady really twisted his arm—

ALLISON. Had him right by the arm! (Laughter.) Tell you what, folks. Let's watch Mr. Hechler's bill and let's watch the screaming and yelling of Mr. Maginnis and his association.

Thank you so much for coming—both of you . . . I think Mr. Hechler deserves so very much credit for feeling a public responsibility to the people of Washington who can't vote for him or anybody else . . . well, they know how he feels. Thank you, Ken.

MAGINNIS. Thank you, Steve.

HECHLER. Thanks a lot, Steve.

ALLISON. Okay, now, if you'll get out of the chair . . . (laughter) Well, here's your hat—what's your hurry?

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT THE DEDICATION OF THE ATLANTIC UNDERSEA TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an address by the Vice President.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, dedicated the Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center in West Palm Beach, Fla., on February 26, 1967, thus adding new muscle to the Navy's arm of defense.

The Navy has been charged with the defense of the Nation in the sea since our beginning days. It has also been responsible not only for the defense on the surface, but under the seas as well.

With the dedication of AUTECH, the United States, under the direction of the Navy, has the world's most advanced deep water testing range. The range is located off Andros Island in the Bahama Islands, and the command center is located in West Palm Beach.

Primarily, the center will be used for purposes of national security, as the Vice President pointed out in his address. At the same time, the Vice President made specific note that the Nation as a whole, will benefit in many other areas.

Industry and education will reap rewards from the research done at AUTECH. We will learn more about the problems of weather, erosion, and oceanology in general. In preparing our defense systems, the work done at AUTECH will affect almost every facet of our lives. And in the not too distant future, the hungry of the world may realize benefits of the research done here.

This effort was not a singular one. The Government of the Bahamas gave us her hand of friendship. His Excellency, Sir Ralph Grey, represented the Government of the Bahamas at the dedication, and reaffirmed the willingness of his country to work with the United States.

The three members of the Cabinet, the Honorable Clarence A. Bain, the Honorable Randol F. Fawkes, and the Honorable Curtis McMillan, each indicated their country's wish to continue to build the friendship between our two nations.

I would also like to commend the Navy for their cooperation, and for the part its officers played in making the project a successful one.

The people of Palm Beach County also played an important role in the commissioning of AUTECH, specifically, the Ocean Sciences and Engineering Council of Palm Beach County, and the Palm Beach County commissioners.

The following also participated in the program:

Hon. GEORGE A. SMATHERS, U.S. Senate.

Hon. Dr. Robert A. Frosch, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, R. & D.

Vice Adm. C. E. Weakley, USN, commander, ASW Forces, Atlantic.

Rear Adm. P. M. Compston, Royal Navy, United Kingdom naval attaché.

Rear Adm. Odale D. Waters, USN, oceanographer of the Navy.

Rear Adm. Thomas A. Christopher, USN, commander, Naval Base, Key West, Fla.

Rear Adm. E. J. Fahy, USN, commander, Naval Ship Systems Command.

Rear Adm. J. W. Kelly, CHC, USN, chief of chaplains, U.S. Navy.

Hon. Turner B. Shelton, U.S. consul general, Bahamas.

Mr. E. F. Van Kessel, chairman, Palm Beach County Commission.

Dr. Kenneth Williams, president, Florida Atlantic University.

Msgr. J. P. O'Mahoney, St. Edward's Church, Palm Beach, Fla.

Mr. John H. Perry, Jr., member, U.S. Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources.

Mr. Billy B. Burns, chairman, Ocean Sciences and Engineering Council of Palm Beach County.

Capt. L. L. Jackson, Jr., USN, commanding officer, AUTECH.

Capt. Frederic A. M. Hooper, USN, director of research, Naval Ship Systems Command.

Mr. Vincent J. Prestipino, director, AUTECH, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Donald J. O'Meara, technical director, AUTECH.

Comdr. G. Barney, USN, officer in charge, AUTECH, Andros Island, Bahamas.

At this time I would like to enter into the Record the address made by the Vice President at the dedication of the Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center:

(By Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, AUTECH, February 26, 1967)

It is a privilege to be here with the distinguished representatives of the Bahamas, of Florida, and of the United States. We look to the people of the Bahamas as good friends and neighbors. Your Excellency, Sir Ralph Grey, Lady Grey, and members of the Bahamas Cabinet—I extend, through you, the greetings of our people to your distinguished Prime Minister, Mr. Pindling, to the members of his Government, and to every citizen of the Bahamas. And, through the distinguished representative of the British Embassy, I once again extend the thanks and appreciation of the people of the United States to our friends in the United Kingdom and our friends throughout the Commonwealth for their partnership, their friendship, and their helpfulness in the common cause of human freedom.

I am honored to participate in the ceremonies commissioning this Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center. When my friend Congressman Rogers asked me to come, I readily accepted. I did so because of the importance of this Center to our common defense. I did so because Congressman Rogers, in cooperation with the other members of the Florida delegation, has done so much for the advancement of the marine sciences. I predict, Congressman Rogers, that your work on behalf of the marine sciences—generally known as oceanography—will give you a place of esteem and honor in the history of our country that will be to your everlasting credit.

This Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center includes shore laboratories, tracking stations, underwater instrumentation, and many other facilities, plus the personnel to operate them. The investment in facilities alone will run to over \$100 mil-

lion. When this Center is fully developed, it will be able substantially to advance the Navy's capabilities in undersea technology.

For 169 years the United States Navy has been charged with the responsibility for our nation's defenses on, over, and under water. That responsibility has been faithfully fulfilled. It has increasingly involved achieving great capabilities, both in offenses and in defense, under the sea. This Center will add to our capabilities in defense, and therefore to our security. It will also add to our power—a power jointly shared with our allies. I might add that this power is not for aggression or conquest, but for self-determination and peace.

The seas have been and still are a potential source of peril. But today they can be a far greater source of wealth and well-being for all men.

As you know, I am chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council as well as the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development. We have with us here today a great astronaut, Commander Scott Carpenter, who represents a living bridge, so to speak, between the marine and the space sciences. As we move along in marine research and development, we may very well find that there is much in common between the environments of outer space and the ocean depths.

We have made astounding progress in outer space in the past several years. Today we are just beginning to open up what I might call "inner space"—the new world of the oceans, covering 71% of the earth's surface.

Somebody asked me the other day: "Mr. Vice President, why do you want to spend money on these programs? What do we care what's at the bottom of the ocean? What do we care what's out there in outer space?"

One answer, of course, is that—like Mt. Everest—it is there. Whatever there is, man wants to know about. But, more significantly we need to know more about the total environment in which we live. We need to know more about the solar system that is our home. We need to know what happens in the seas and at the bottom of the seas. We need to know more about the atmosphere, about the stratosphere, about space and about the other planets. Our home is the universe and this earth is the room in which we live. What happens outside it affects us, so that we need to know more about it. So we have been exploring space, and now we are beginning to explore the oceans.

Eight months ago, new legislation—legislation which owes much to the leadership of Congressman Rogers and Fawcett—declared it to be the policy of the United States "to develop, encourage, and maintain a coordinated, comprehensive, and long-range national program in marine science for the benefit of mankind . . . to assist in the protection of health and property, enhancement of commerce, transportation, and national security, rehabilitation of our commercial fisheries, and increased utilization of these and other resources."

That same legislation established the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, which I have the honor to chair. (Every time the Congress gives the Vice President a statutory responsibility, it seems to be either out of this world or down under the seas!)

This new Council includes five members of the President's Cabinet, as well as the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Director of the National Science Foundation. I think the membership of this Council gives a good measure of the importance that the Congress attaches to this new effort.

In these past eight months, we have identified a number of priority areas for our activities. The President will soon present to the Congress his proposals for moving ahead in the field of marine resources and

engineering development during the coming fiscal year.

I wonder if the people of Florida are aware today of what this new adventure can mean for them tomorrow. Florida, relative to its area, has more seacoast than any other mainland state in America. You have two great bodies of water—the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico, each with its special characteristics and potentialities—right out your doorstep. At Miami—with the University of Miami and the laboratories of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries—you already have one of the leading complexes devoted to oceanic knowledge and research in the world.

This Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center has been established, of course, primarily for purposes of national security—but the knowledge we gain here will help us in many other ways. The topography of the seabed in this area makes it an unmatched sea laboratory—and in years to come it can assume the same importance in oceanography as Cape Kennedy has in Space.

Florida has a virtual hammerlock upon the future—the future in space and oceanography. The people of Florida have already shown a great deal of initiative of their own. Industry has already gone ahead, without waiting upon the help of government funds. I want particularly today to congratulate Louis Reynolds on his Aluminant project, Ed Link on the "Man-in-the-Sea" program, and John Perry on his Cubmarine, which was instrumental in retrieving the H-bomb that was lost off the coast of Spain last year.

It has been a creative partnership of government, industry, and universities—not to forget the support of the Palm Beach County Association—which has gotten these efforts under way. This is the same kind of partnership which has been so successful in our space program—not just government, not just industry, not just the universities, but all working together as a team. I hope that, with this kind of partnership, we can solve many of the other complex problems that face our nation today.

What are the challenges that lie ahead for the marine sciences? Let's look at a few.

There are marinas on the Florida coast which must be dredged every year at a cost sometimes equal to what it cost to build them in the first place. There are harbors whose breakwaters actually increase, rather than diminish, wave action within them. We have to learn more about tides, currents, and waves so that these things will no longer happen.

Through studies of marine organisms, we may gain basic knowledge about the metabolic processes which characterize all life. For instance, some marine organisms reach old age within a few hours; others, which are self-reproducing, are virtually immortal. Their study may give us invaluable insights into the whole process of aging.

There are untapped mineral resources at the bottom of the sea. One of these days we will be exploiting them—it's only a question of developing and applying the necessary technology.

We may learn how to divert hurricanes away from our shores—or even prevent them.

But perhaps the greatest promise of all is that of food from the sea.

One and a half billion of the world's people live tropical and sub-tropical areas, on a diet that is generally short of protein. This protein deficiency may account for as many as half the deaths of children under five—and those who survive often suffer permanent physical and possibly mental impairment. Yet a mere ten grams a day of processed fish protein concentrate—odorless and tasteless—can, if added to a child's regular diet, give him all the protein he needs for normal physical and mental development. And this diet supplement can be provided for less than a penny a day.

These are some of the things that lie ahead—and not too far ahead, at that. For a boy born and raised in South Dakota, where the land is flat and seemingly endless, this is a pretty exciting business.

I think the Congress found the right man to lead us out to sea!

I can't think of anything more exciting than finding out what's really in the sea—not merely skimming its surface, but probing its depths to find out what contribution it can make to our security and well-being.

I remember reading, as a schoolboy, the words of Joseph Conrad: "The sea . . . and its works, for all the talk of men, are wrapped in mystery."

Today we intend to unravel that mystery. We intend to use the oceans and their resources to generate new wealth, new industries, and new jobs. And with the secrets we find, with the new knowledge that surely lies ahead, we intend to build a safer, a kinder, and a more peaceful world.

Walt Whitman put it into words a century ago:

"Joyous we . . . launch out on trackless seas,

Fearless for unknown shores."

Joyously we are launching today a great international effort not only in the field of security and defense, but in science and research for the good of mankind. As we venture forth on this great voyage, let us go with every confidence of success.

I say to the people of Florida—you are lucky, because the ocean about you can be your greatest asset. The wealth of the sea will enrich you, just as it will help all of mankind.

TRIBUTE TO VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the praise that is being given from the White House, from the Democratic National Committee, and from the press of our Nation to the dedicated, eloquent and self-effacing, beloved, great American from Minnesota who is the Vice President of the United States.

I read with enthusiastic approval in the Washington Post of Saturday a splendid editorial which ends:

He is, in truth, the very model of a model Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the entire text of this editorial from the Washington Post of last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorial is as follows:

A MODEL VICE PRESIDENT

It is good to know that President Johnson appreciates the qualities of Vice President Hubert Humphrey as a public servant. His kind remarks about the Vice President at the press conference on Thursday certainly are deserved. It would be dismaying indeed if the President did not hold these views.

The Vice President has brilliantly succeeded in an office that presents the greatest difficulty to a man of his temperament and genius. Congress has given him two special tasks to which he devotes great attention—outer space and undersea exploration. The

President has showered him with special duties and missions. He has dealt with all of them competently and quietly. History will have to disclose how valuable he has been in the inside councils of the Administration but there is reason to believe he has been very useful there.

The most important legacy that he will leave the country will be a concept of the Vice Presidency that fits both its subordinate position in the Executive Branch and the necessities of modern administration. Not for an instant has he allowed himself a word or a deed that would indicate any confusion about the place where there resides the constitutional duty and power to speak for the Government of the United States. He has rightly said, and repeatedly said, that there can be only one authoritative voice—and that is the voice of the President. He has been the President's echo on every public policy discussion of the Administration. And whenever the Vice President, under our system, tries to be anything other than that, "the trumpet maketh an uncertain sound."

No wonder the President admires his public service. The thoughtful citizens of this country also admire it and understand it. He is, in truth, the very model of a model Vice President.

STALIN'S DAUGHTER SHOULD BE GIVEN ASYLUM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States celebrated the 20th anniversary of the Truman doctrine—a policy to contain communism and give hope to enslaved people—in a disgraceful manner last weekend by refusing asylum to a woman who sought refuge from the heartland of the Communist empire.

It was disgraceful, because the refusal had nothing to do with actions or attitudes of the woman herself. She was neither a criminal nor a political troublemaker.

The refusal was political expediency, plain and simple. We must hang our heads in shame, because it broke the hallowed tradition which has made the name America a bright beacon of hope to all those who long for the day when they too can escape from tyranny, walk into a U.S. embassy and be assured asylum.

Until last weekend America was a star to which they could pin their hopes with confidence. But no more. Asylum now may be denied in order to protect that will o' the wisp of international politics called détente. As this grim news makes the rounds, hope will wink out in hundreds and thousands of desolate places.

What an ugly milestone in the long course of liberty's struggle against tyranny. After precisely 20 years of persistent work—so costly in blood and dollars—the world's mightiest military power serving the world's freest people fears to shelter a woman because to do so might irritate the world's most powerful dictatorship.

Has the struggle ground to nothing our sense of values? Those who struggled must shudder when they learn that the United States is so obsessed with

placating dictatorship that it turns away a woman seeking safety.

The woman, of course, is the daughter of Russia's bloodiest tyrant. Joe Stalin must be grinning in his grave. In rejecting his daughter's plea, America passed up the greatest opportunity since the Bolshevik revolution 50 years ago to reveal the bankruptcy of Communist life and the promise of freedom.

I cannot believe this is what the American people really want. Better late than never, the United States must reverse its decision, open its doors to this woman, and put together as best it can the shattered fragments of a once great tradition.

If Soviet civility can be purchased only by sacrificing American compassion for people seeking freedom, the price is too high.

EQUITABLE TARIFF TREATMENT FOR THE PAPERMAKING MACHINERY INDUSTRY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join today with other Members of this body in sponsoring legislation to raise the duty on paper industries machinery to 20 percent ad valorem, so as to correct a serious tariff inequity on U.S. imports of papermaking machinery and related items.

This is a matter of deep concern to me because of the number of affected plants manufacturing paper industries machinery in Ohio, some of which are in my own congressional district.

It is also a matter of concern because of the serious loss in a favorable balance of trade.

This inequity grows out of the fact that the executive branch of the U.S. Government in successive trade agreement negotiations has reduced the U.S. duty from the level of 35 percent ad valorem to the very low level of 7 percent for most items in the category, 10 percent for some others, and 13½ percent for certain parts used in the machinery.

On the other hand, we have allowed the foreign countries which are the principal suppliers of papermaking machinery in world trade to retain high tariffs and, in addition, to impose frontier taxes which greatly affect the effective level of monetary charges which must be paid to gain entry for U.S. machinery exports into these countries.

The principal producers of papermaking machinery are Canada, West Germany, France, Italy, the United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, and Finland. The combined ad valorem equivalent of their import duties and frontier taxes on U.S. exports of papermaking machinery ranges from 20 percent in West Germany to 48 percent in France.

This inequity is dramatized by the cur-

rent trends in our imports and exports. Under the stimulation of the excessively low rate of duty on U.S. imports, foreign-produced papermaking machinery has poured into the United States at a rapidly accelerating rate. From \$7 million worth of machines in 1962, U.S. imports have swelled to more than \$25 million worth in the first 11 months of 1966—more than triple the 1962 volume.

At the same time, our exports have been sharply damped down by the restrictive tariffs and frontier taxes imposed by the foreign producers with the result that the value of our exports dropped from \$83 million in 1962 to \$55 million during the first 11 months of 1966—a net loss of \$46 million in a favorable balance of trade.

In the past, the papermaking machinery industry has been an important contributor of new employment in the United States. Compared with the average level of employment during the years 1958 to 1960, employment climbed in 1965 to the level of 20,041 jobs—an 18-percent increase. This is more than twice the rate of increase in new jobs in the average of all manufacturing industries in the United States during the same period.

This achievement in the creation of new jobs was the product of a very rapid rate of new capital expenditures by the industry. During the period mentioned annual capital expenditures for new plant and equipment increased by 104 percent in comparison with a much lower rate of increase, 74 percent for the average of all manufacturing industries.

Notwithstanding the U.S. industry's determination and courage in improving and expanding its plant capacity and adding new jobs, the pressure of the rising level of the imports and the loss of outlets for its production through the declining exports contributed to a sharp squeeze on the industry's profits. Between the average of 1958-60, on the one hand, and the year 1965, on the other, the ratio of the industry's gross earnings before taxes to the value of shipments dropped by more than 12 percent. This was in especially sharp contrast to the experience of all manufacturing industries as a whole in which the gross earnings ratio increased by 9 percent, 1961 to 1965.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is of deep concern to me because there are 13 plants manufacturing paper industries machinery located in the State of Ohio, and two of these are located in Clark County in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of more than 20 Members of this body who in the last session introduced concurrent resolutions expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should exercise the unqualified right of the United States under article XXVIII of the GATT to modify our import duties by effecting a partial withdrawal of past concessions to restore the duty to the 20-percent level described above.

The firm life of tariff concessions under GATT is three years subject to automatic renewal for 3-year periods, unless a contracting party gives notice during the 6-months' period prior to the ter-

mination of the 3-year period of its intention to withdraw or modify particular tariffs. Mr. Speaker, other nations have frequently exercised their right under article XXVIII to correct problems which have arisen through the selective modification or withdrawal of tariffs during the "open season" provided by article XXVIII. Frequently the United States has acquiesced in such actions without demanding compensation.

In this instance, it was my judgment and that of more than 20 of my colleagues that any compensation which the affected countries might demand could readily be worked out in the tariff bargaining which is taking place in the Kennedy round of trade agreement negotiations. It is a well-publicized fact that other nations have not matched U.S. offers in the Kennedy round, and the modification of the paper industries machinery tariff is a tiny item that could have been thrown on the scales to help achieve a better balance in the negotiations.

Regretfully, Mr. Speaker, the executive branch declined to act on the domestic industry's petition for a partial withdrawal of the tariff concessions on papermaking machinery. No specific reason was given other than the expression that it was the judgment of the executive branch that no compelling reason had been shown for the action.

It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that the sharply rising imports, the equally serious drop in exports, and the great disparity between our low level of 7 percent and the foreign countries' tariff-tax levels ranging from 20 to 48 percent more than satisfied the executive branch's need to feel that there was "compelling reason" for the action.

Nevertheless, since the executive branch allowed this opportunity to slip through its fingers, it is now necessary for the Congress to deal with the situation by positive legislation. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I introduce my bill to raise the duty on paper industries machinery to 20 percent ad valorem and I strongly urge the Committee on Ways and Means to schedule early hearings on the bill.

REVITALIZATION OF THE HOUSING AND HOME BUILDING SEGMENT OF OUR NATION'S ECONOMY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy today to read to my colleagues a telegram which has been received by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, from Mr. E. Stanley Enlund, president of the First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Chicago, which is located in the 7th Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent in this Congress. It reads as follows:

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Knowing of your concern for the revitalization of the housing and home building segment of our Nation's economy we are pleased to advise you of major action taken yesterday by us. Effective immediately we have lowered our conventional home mortgage rates one-half percent to a range of 5½ to 6 percent. In our news release we indicated that "this reduction was made with the specific purpose of stimulating Chicago's lagging mortgage market." Our decision "reflects President Johnson's concern over the state of the housing and home building segment of our economy and is consistent with the Federal home loan bank board's own efforts to stimulate this important market" as the largest savings and loan association in Chicago—also the city's leading mortgage lender—we felt it important that we take the lead to move decisively in the best interests of our customers and our community. It is our hope that this sharp reduction in mortgage rates will stimulate the housing market in the Chicagoland area and that other lenders throughout our country will follow our lead in an effort to reactivate this market across our Nation.

Respectfully,

E. STANLEY ENLUND,
President, First Federal Savings and
Loan Association of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the actions of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Chicago, and I am hoping that other financial institutions throughout America will follow in this direction.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that I have, today, placed in the hopper a House joint resolution calling for the designation of the second week of May each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week."

At the present time, over 900,000 schoolchildren serve in the safety patrol, serving 40,000 schools in 15,000 communities throughout the country. Since the patrol was established in 1922, some 16 million persons have participated.

The record of these young men and women is truly impressive. Since the patrols' founding, the traffic death rate of school-age children has dropped nearly one-half while the death rate of all other age groups has doubled.

In recognition of the fine work these youngsters do, each May representative groups are brought to Washington for an impressive parade down Constitution Avenue. The parade is sponsored by the schools and the police with the American Automobile Association acting as coordinator.

Last year some 537 youngsters from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts participated in the parade, and I am happy that this year there will be a contingent of 25 students sponsored by the Tri-County Motor Club in Holyoke com-

ing to Washington along with a large contingent of students from Springfield.

The importance of the event can readily be ascertained by a look at the distinguished persons who have assisted in this program each year.

In conjunction with the parade, the American Automobile Association each year presents Gold Lifesaver Medals to those young patrol heroes who have actually saved the life of a schoolmate in traffic danger. Last year Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY presented the awards and served as grand marshal for the parade.

In past years, Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman; Vice President Nixon; and Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY have presented the awards.

In urging my colleague to join with me in introducing similar resolutions, so that the Nation may more properly pay tribute to these young men and women, I would like to point out that day after day, the patrol members serve their schoolmates, guiding them and protecting them against traffic accidents.

Supervision, to keep their work on an efficient basis, is provided through a designated teacher, the patrol supervisor, who is made responsible by the school principal for the patrols. A patrol captain and one or more lieutenants, selected from the patrol membership, carry out the daily inspection and operation of the group under the direction of the patrol supervisor.

So the patrol members not only learn at a young age to serve their fellow students, but they learn the responsibilities of leadership as well.

In the classroom, schoolchildren learn rules for safe walking. On the streets, the patrol members see to it that these rules are applied at patrol locations several times daily.

By constant repetition, good habits of street use are formed and become automatic. Once firmly established, these sound habits govern at all street crossings and hopefully stay with them in later life, although our soaring pedestrian fatality rate indicates that many "adults" could use some training in safe walking.

INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR FOSTER CHILD

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that it has been the purpose of the Congress to provide fair and equitable provisions in the Internal Revenue Code. It is understandable, however, that inequities do occur occasionally as the code is applied to individual circumstances. In the legislation I am proposing today, I am seeking to amend the code to deal with one unfair aspect of it and to assure that parents of foster children are accorded such income tax exemptions as are proper.

The status of dependents in our tax laws is particularly complex. To be claimed as a dependent, a person must meet five tests: support, gross income, member of household or relationship, citizenship, and joint return. The first test, support, means that in order to be claimed as a dependent, a person must receive over half of his total support from the taxpayer during the calendar year. The second test, gross income, means that a person cannot be claimed as a dependent if he received over \$600 of gross income during the calendar year. The third test states that if the person being claimed is a member of the taxpayer's household and lives with the taxpayer during the entire year, it is not necessary that he be related to the taxpayer. Close relatives may still be claimed as dependents although they do not live with the taxpayer. The fourth test is citizenship; a dependent must be a citizen or resident of the United States, or a resident of Canada, Mexico, the Canal Zone, or the Republic of Panama, for the year he is claimed as a dependent. Fifth, an exemption for a dependent is not allowed if the dependent files a joint return. These tests are well known to anyone who has claimed tax exemptions for dependents. In addition, the provisions whereby the gross income test may be disregarded are also well understood. The law states that if a person earns \$600 or over during the calendar year, he may not be claimed as a dependent. However, if the dependent is the taxpayer's child who is a full-time student and he earns over \$600 in the calendar year, he may still be claimed as a dependent as long as he meets the other tests. This same provision applies to children under age 19; if a child under 19 earns over \$600, he may still be claimed as a dependent as long as he meets the other tests.

I am not questioning these provisions, but in going deeper into this situation, it is proper to ask what is the definition of "child" in this situation. A child is defined as a natural son or daughter, stepson or daughter, or legally adopted son or daughter. In 1959, the code was amended to include in this definition a child who is a member of the taxpayer's household as a result of being placed there by an authorized placement agency for legal adoption. This definition, however, does not include foster children, and it is this omission which I feel is inequitable.

Certainly, we probably all know of instances where children are members of a household and in all respects are treated as if they were the children of the parents, but for various reasons they have not been legally adopted. I am thinking of situations where there is a desire not to change the family name of the child or where the child is actually a relative, perhaps the natural child of a close member of the family.

Consider the situation of a man and his wife who have as their foster son a boy of 17 years of age. We can all understand the decision of the parents not to legally adopt him and change his surname when he is already well into his teens. But the bearing of a different surname in no way affects the full nature of the parental relationship. At the

appropriate time, such parents may pay the boy's college expenses and he may share in their estate. One summer, let us say, the young man happens to earn more than \$600 to help meet his future educational expenses. If he were a natural son, or a stepson, or a legally adopted son, his parents could still claim him as a dependent. As a foster son, they cannot.

It is my feeling that it has not been the purpose of the law to exclude intentionally foster children from this particular definition. However, the exclusion of foster children from the present law is being interpreted by the Internal Revenue Service as prohibiting tax deductions for the parents of such children. I do not argue that the Internal Revenue Service has administrative authority to do otherwise. It is for that reason that I am offering a bill to make certain that justice is done and that the parents of foster children are treated equitably in our tax laws. My bill amends paragraph (2) of section 152(b), the definition of "child" in the cases for which the \$600 may be disregarded, by including the phrase "foster child of an individual." This in no way affects the other four tests; they must still be met.

It is my sincere hope that this bill can receive favorable action by the Congress, thus correcting this inequitable situation.

THE TEXTILE IMPORT PROBLEM AND ITS BEARING ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. STRATTON. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern which has already been expressed in this House with regard to the serious threat imposed on the domestic industry as a result of the overwhelming increase of textile imports to the United States. Many of us in the Congress have been hopeful that a part of this import problem could be resolved through an international agreement. We are, however, greatly disturbed that textile imports have tripled since 1961 and if proper attention is not given to this problem, the basic structure of the textile industry will be severely damaged.

One of my major concerns is the devastating effect that these imports will have on our domestic labor force if they continue to come to the United States at the present abusive rate. We are fully aware of the fact that wage rates in foreign countries are far lower than in the United States. We also know that other costs of manufacturing in the United States are much higher than in foreign countries. Since these factors are so very important in the cost structure of production, they give an overwhelming advantage to foreign mills. Then too, foreign mills have demonstrated time and time again that they can shift their textile production to the

most popular and profitable textile items in the United States. This gives them a double advantage of exploiting the U.S. textile market in such a way that it has a devastating effect in the marketplace here at home.

We should also fully evaluate textile imports as they relate to our national security and defense procurement program. Textile products are second only to steel from the standpoint of defense requirements and through the years, textile products have proven to be vital and essential to our combat readiness program. Some experts have suggested that modern warfare would be of short duration because of the possible use of the atomic bomb and therefore have concluded that textiles would not have the same important status which they held in the Korean war and World War II. This theory proved to be invalid in the conflict with Korea and the same is true in the case of Vietnam. In fact, the situation which now exists in Vietnam is proof that a vast amount of manpower and equipment is essential in conducting this operation. Instead of less emphasis on textiles, they have become more important to the Vietnam conflict than any time in history, as I observed when I visited Vietnam personally in 1966. The textile and apparel industries are providing clothes, underwear, jeep covers, parachutes, tents for housing troops, supplies and equipment, and in fact, a great variety of other essential textile items, such as durable but light tropical jungle uniforms.

I am proud of the fine record and contribution which Norwich Mills, Norwich, N.Y., is making to our national defense program. This mill located in my district produces sizable quantities of underwear for the Armed Forces. I have been advised that the total underwear industry estimates that at the end of this fiscal year, which ends June 30, 1967, they will have provided over 47 million garments to all branches of the military service. The same applies to other textile shops, small as well as large, in our district.

The textile industry should be commended for the outstanding service it is rendering in supplying essential items for defense needs. It should be pointed out that they have voluntarily dropped many of their civilian accounts in an effort to meet the heavy demands for textiles to supply military requirements. Many of these items are complicated from the standpoint of construction and are manufactured under the most rigid specifications. In an effort to meet the heavy demands of military requirements, costly adjustments were necessary within the industry, but they have come through in an exceptionally fine way and have demonstrated once again that they are a vital and essential part of our national defense operation. This record of achievement is certainly impressive evidence that we cannot, and should not, permit imports to continue their rapid rise in this country, and to such an extent that they threaten the basic foundation of this industry and weaken the ability of the textile industry to supply our military requirements.

Mr. Speaker, there is every indication

that the present duty situation on textile items is not discouraging imports to the United States and it would certainly appear to be a serious mistake to reduce the duties under the GATT negotiations on any textile items. It seems to me that the basic part of this problem can be fully resolved by strict enforcement of the International Cotton Textile Agreement, and I concur that this arrangement should be continued for at least 5 or 6 years and that a similar arrangement should be worked out for wool and manmade textiles.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Star on March 10, Columnist David Lawrence discusses the far-reaching consequences of a decision by the Supreme Court to force this body to seat the ex-Congressman from Harlem, Adam Clayton Powell. Quite correctly he points out that any such ruling would be a complete reversal of the position the Court has taken for over 100 years.

Knowing the Supreme Court as I do, it is quite possible they will try to ride roughshod over the House in this matter and I think it would be well for every Member to be familiar with the ramifications of such an action as delineated by Mr. Lawrence. His column follows:

POWELL CASE AND 14TH AMENDMENT

(By David Lawrence)

Adam Clayton Powell and the entire civil-rights movement have more to lose than gain if the Supreme Court should rule that the House of Representatives must grant a seat to the Harlem minister. For if the Supreme Court chooses to overrule the House of Representatives about who shall be admitted to a seat in Congress, it will be a reversal of the attitude taken nearly 100 years ago when the highest court in the land refused even to consider such questions.

To put it another way, if the judiciary should take jurisdiction and order that a seat in Congress be given Adam Clayton Powell, then the validity of the 14th Amendment, which was fraudulently adopted, could be challenged now because in 1865, when it was first voted on, certain members of both houses were denied seats in Congress. The Supreme Court has always claimed it has been without power to intervene.

Historians have never disagreed about the facts. When the War between the States ended with Lee's surrender on April 9, 1865, President Lincoln proclaimed amnesty. Yet in December 1865, when the 39th Congress convened, both houses decided to deny seats to the members from 10 Southern states, including those whose legislatures had ratified the 13th Amendment abolishing slavery. Thaddeus Stevens, the Northern leader in Congress, based his case on the constitutional provision which says that "each house shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members."

This is the same provision that was cited recently by the House of Representatives in connection with its resolution excluding Powell. Yet every person elected to Congress from the South in the December 1865 ses-

sion was over 25 years of age, an inhabitant of his own state, a citizen of the United States, and was elected by the people—the sole qualifications for admission according to Powell's lawyers.

When the new session of Congress began in December 1865, it was apparent that the 14th Amendment could not get a two-thirds majority in both houses unless the South was excluded. This amendment was submitted to the states by Congress on June 16, 1866. In the Reconstruction Act, which was passed in March 1867 by the "rump" Congress, it was declared that the 10 Southern states whose legislatures had rejected the 14th Amendment would not be permitted representation until their legislatures ratified the amendment.

Again and again, efforts were made to challenge these acts of a "rump" Congress. It was pointed out that the Constitution itself said no state could be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate without its consent, that peace had come to the nation, and that there was no longer any insurrection. But the Supreme Court of the United States deliberately put the issue aside and refused to make any ruling.

The explanation given at the time—and ever since—was that these were "political" questions and that the Supreme Court felt it had no right to interfere with the way Congress operates—whom it should admit and whom it should reject.

What would happen now if the Supreme Court suddenly decides to overrule Congress and compel the admission of Adam Clayton Powell, especially if he is elected again next month? If the high court abandons its historic position that it has no authority over who shall sit in Congress, then certainly another test could immediately ensue on the validity of the 14th Amendment itself. For even the lapse of time does not alter the historic facts or the constitutional issues.

Civil-rights laws today have as their legal foundation the 14th Amendment. So a victory for Powell in recovering his seat could easily turn out to be a set-back for civil-rights movement.

The "ratification" of the 14th Amendment has, to be sure, been accepted thus far as a realistic fact by the Supreme Court, but it could be subjected to new challenges raising questions as to the propriety of the method of "ratification" actually used. If the amendment were declared null and void, a substitute would then have to be enacted and submitted to the States. Public opinion would doubtless favor adoption, but Congress would also have to re-examine and reenact the previous legislation on civil rights.

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, next month, President Johnson will attend a meeting of the American Presidents at Punta del Este in Uruguay, to give new impetus to the Alliance for Progress.

Among the multiple interests and programs of accomplishment achieved in the years of the Alliance there has developed a grassroots, extragovernmental movement which has caught the interest of the people of many of our States as well as many of our Latin American neighbors.

It is called, Partners of the Alliance. This concept, less than 3 years old,

sprang from a desire to involve private citizens on an active program of mutual assistance. In 1966 the organization expanded its membership and scope of operations to include 31 U.S. States and the District of Columbia and 15 Latin American republics. Members include educators and students, business leaders and trade unionists, doctors and nurses, and representatives of many other professions and community organizations. At their local, regional, and international meetings they exchange ideas and collaborate on projects which will promote the aims and spread the benefits of their alliance within the Alliance for Progress.

Since its founding, the program has provided a flow of three to four million dollars worth of technical and material assistance within the partnership. This exchange takes in such diverse items as high school and university scholarships, agricultural, and electrical equipment and tools.

A major share of the U.S. Partners' attention has been focused on the shipment of hospital equipment to Latin American rural areas and the implementation of impact-type projects in community development.

Most important is the growing understanding of attitudes and problems which have developed into firm friendships on a working basis.

In late 1966, the U.S. Partners formed a national association and elected their first national president—Edward Marcus, of Texas, civic leader, and executive vice president of Neiman-Marcus.

In the pervasive hemispheric scope of the Alliance for Progress, this organization is indeed small in size, but nevertheless, significant. It manifests the deep feelings of mutual friendship between the peoples of Latin America and our own and, indeed, lends substance and validity to the great overall effort of the Alliance for Progress.

This spirit of brotherhood is strong, I believe, in the general feeling in this country about the Alliance for Progress. I am pleased to count myself among the enthusiastic supporters of President Johnson's programs in Latin America, and I wish him well as he and his fellow Presidents undertake discussions to give a new phase to the alliance.

TAX CREDIT PROVISIONS OF LAIRD REVENUE-SHARING BILL—H.R. 5450

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include charts and drafts of revenue proceedings.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, when I recently took the well of the House—February 15, 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 3443 to 3463—to introduce my new revenue-sharing bill, H.R. 5450, I delivered extensive remarks on various aspects of revenue sharing. I also discussed the general failure of the current grant-in-aid approach to the problems of our States and localities. This subject is one which concerns us all, and will be the subject of further detailed discussion in the weeks and months ahead.

Today, however, my remarks will be confined to one particular aspect of the Laird revenue-sharing bill. That aspect is section 13 of the bill which provides a credit against Federal taxes on the income of individuals for State and local taxes paid.

The distinction between a tax credit and a tax deduction is a simple one. The tax deduction permits an individual to lower his net income for computing his Federal income tax liability. A tax credit, on the other hand, is applied to the total tax obligation of an individual and is treated in the same manner as if it were a cash payment on the Federal income tax which an individual must pay.

Section 13 of my bill provides an initial tax credit of 10 percent in the first year of its operation. Then, the amount of the tax credit is increased by 10 percent each year until the plan is fully operational in the fourth year and the tax credit has reached 40 percent.

Section 13 of my bill is primarily designed to return additional tax sources to the States by reducing the Federal tax burden on individual taxpayers. The tax credit section would affect the average married taxpayer with two children in the following way:

At 10 percent, no matter what the income level, every taxpayer would be better off taking the tax deduction provided for under present law. This was done in order to preclude any drain on the Federal Treasury in the first year both because of the Vietnam war and in order to give the States time to plan their own tax programs after the legislation is enacted.

Section 13 also provides that the taxpayer will always have the choice of a tax credit or a tax deduction. This is so structured that while it will benefit most taxpayers to take a tax credit, some income taxpayers would still find it to their best interests to take the present tax deduction.

I have had a table prepared which shows the effect of this new method of tax computation on a typical individual with a family of four.

At the 20-percent tax credit level in the second year of operation, the family of four with an income of \$5,500 would save \$15.95 by taking the credit rather than the deduction. For the same income level, with a 30-percent tax credit, the saving would amount to \$47.85 for the average family of four. When fully operational in the fourth year of the program, the family would save a total of \$79.75.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the table which shows the effect of the Laird revenue sharing bill's tax credit section be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Before that, however, let me point out that under section 13, when an individual's net tax obligation is less than the amount of credit which he can claim, the individual's tax obligation will be zero. Under present law, of course, he would not receive a rebate for the full amount of the credit which he has computed. This would also be true under section 13 of H.R. 5450.

Another point to bear in mind when examining this table, is that the figures for deductions are averages based on the total returns filed in that income category with the Internal Revenue Service.

The most recent complete data which is available on this subject covers calendar year 1964. It is this data on which the enclosed table is based.

The table referred to follows:

Comparison of estimated tax benefits by various income level taxpayers from (1) deduction for State and local taxes under present law, and (2) tax credit in lieu of deduction, as proposed in the Laird revenue sharing bill, H.R. 5450 (90th Cong.)

[Computations based on a family of 4]

Income level ¹	Income tax liability ²	Average deduction for State and local taxes	Tax benefit from deduction of State and local taxes	Estimated tax credit, and net tax benefit ³ therefrom, for State and local taxes							
				10-percent credit		20-percent credit		30-percent credit		40-percent credit	
				Amount of tax credit	Net tax benefit	Amount of tax credit	Net tax benefit	Amount of tax credit	Net tax benefit	Amount of tax credit	Net tax benefit
\$3,500.....	\$36	\$217	\$30.88	\$21.70	—\$8.68	\$43.40	\$13.02	\$65.10	\$34.72	\$86.80	\$56.42
\$5,500.....	281	319	47.85	31.90	—15.95	63.80	15.95	95.70	47.85	127.60	79.75
\$7,500.....	555	438	74.46	43.80	—30.66	87.60	13.14	131.40	56.94	175.20	100.74
\$12,500.....	1,386	679	129.79	67.90	—61.89	135.80	6.01	203.70	73.91	271.60	141.81
\$17,500.....	2,348	962	222.17	96.20	—125.97	192.40	—29.77	286.60	66.43	384.80	162.63
\$35,000.....	7,228	1,541	564.63	154.10	—410.53	308.20	—256.43	462.30	—102.33	616.40	51.77
\$75,000.....	24,783	3,394	1,798.82	339.40	—1,459.42	678.80	—1,120.02	1,018.20	—780.62	1,357.60	—441.22

¹ All income is assumed to be earned income.

² Tax computations made on the following assumptions (and rounded to the nearest dollar): (a) The taxpayers itemized their deductions. The amount of deductions used in the computations were the average deductions for the respective income classes. These were derived from basic data in "Preliminary Report, Statistics of Income—1964, Individual Income Tax Returns." (b) Taxpayers use the tax rate schedule.

³ The net tax benefit is equal to the tax credit (allowed under H.R. 5450) less the deduction allowed under present law. A minus figure for the net tax benefit indicates that the deduction will provide a larger tax saving than the tax credit will.

⁴ Since the credit is limited to the tax liability of the taxpayer, before applying the credit, the net tax benefit, in this example, would be limited to \$36. (A tax credit of \$66.38 (i.e., \$30.88 + \$36) would provide this maximum benefit.)

THE U.S. COMMERCIAL FISHING FLEET

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there are encouraging signs for our fishing fleet these days. From the scallopers out of New Bedford, Mass., to the shrimpers out of the gulf ports and the long-liners that put out from the west coast for tuna.

It is one of our oldest and proudest industries.

It is an industry where once the United States led other nations of the world; an industry where she slipped, but it would appear that America is making a comeback, and with unity of effort and cooperation can make tremendous progress. The coming exposition will afford the means for such unity and cooperation. The U.S. commercial fishing industry annually produces about 5 billion pounds of fish and shellfish. Based on our present knowledge of resources off our coast, it is reasonable to expect the production to increase five times if resources not now used or only partially used are earnestly employed by our fishermen.

While the United States now ranks fifth in the community of fishing nations, there are several factors which lead us to believe that the industry could and will be more vital in the coming years.

There is the most encouraging factor, the rising demand for fish and shellfish. Total utilization per person runs from 55 pounds in 1965 to about 64 pounds in 1966. This can be increased. More new vessels entered the U.S. fishing fleet in 1966 than in any other year since the 1950's.

The Government's ship construction program, in which I was glad to play a leading part, passed by the Congress, has been a vital factor in this surge. This program should be increased. We are now seeing American capital building factory ships that we hope will restore the U.S. position in the international fishing scene.

Last February 2 the Food and Drug Administration approved fish flour for human consumption. Now President Johnson has signed a bill authorizing construction of one fish flour pilot plant and plans for a second to investigate how this flour can alleviate the food problems of the emerging nations.

Although the United States imports 60 percent of its fisheries products and although the industry does not play a major part in our total trade, commercial fishing jumped to \$100 million in 1966. Our larger stake in this vital industry increased our international responsibilities.

This October, for the first time in its history, the American commercial fishing industry will have an exposition, to be held in Boston. This will be a trade show to foster cooperation and under-

standing between all segments of the industry, with a view to aiding its long-range growth. Participating in the exposition will be leaders from all segments of the industry with international representation as well as American, are invited.

Considering the position of the United States in the world community of nations, it seems appropriate that we provide leadership in commercial fishing. In order to do this, we must:

First. Put increased emphasis on the development of more efficient and lower cost methods of harvesting fish.

Second. Make greater use of underutilized and unutilized species.

Third. Place greater emphasis on applications of new technology and research findings.

Fourth. Increase public awareness of the health and nutritional advantage of fishery products as a regular item in our diets.

The American Commercial Fish Exposition with its seminars will be a place where these matters will be discussed and advanced. It is the first of its kind in the Nation and will be sponsored by one of the largest newspapers in the East, the Boston Globe.

The interest in the coming exposition should, as I hope, and urge, be active and widespread.

I include a press release containing information about the exposition made by the American Commercial Fish Exposition, Inc., on February 24, 1967.

This October, for the first time in its history, the American commercial fishing industry will have an exposition, a trade show to foster cooperation and understanding between all segments of the industry, with a view to aiding its long range growth.

Mr. Davis Taylor, Boston newspaper publisher and president of the organization sponsoring the show, announced that the first American Commercial Fish Exposition will be held in Boston this fall from Tuesday, October 10, through October 14.

Participating in the Exposition will be leaders from all segments of the industry with international representation invited as well as American. The federal and state governments have promised complete cooperation, along with research and educational institutions, the commercial fishermen themselves, fleet owners, naval architects, manufacturers and suppliers of equipment, and the industry's trade publications.

In addition to exhibits of all the latest methods, gear engines, hardware, nets and electronics equipment at the show itself, seminars will be held each day of the show. These seminars will cover all fields of the commercial fishing industry, including detection and catching, handling, fishing vessels and subsidies, as well as the processing and marketing phases of the business. The sponsoring firm is a corporation jointly owned by the Globe Newspaper Company and Attorney Richard A. Sullivan of Boston. Davis Taylor, publisher of The Boston Globe is president, and Attorney Sullivan is executive director.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago yesterday—March 12—the House of Representatives passed the bill which provided for admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union. The House vote was overwhelming: 323 Members gave enthusiastic approval of the Hawaii statehood bill, while only 89 Members opposed it.

I rise to take the floor at this time, Mr. Speaker, to thank those whom I can now call my colleagues and who worked tirelessly and endlessly for a cause which to their own constituents meant little or nothing, but to over half a million Americans in the middle of the Pacific Ocean meant political justice and a full and final recognition of their proven loyalty to American ideals. I wish to thank those Members, too, who voted against Hawaii's admission but who have subsequently seen enlightenment and helped in different ways to make Hawaii the great State that it is today after only 8 short years.

I wish further to assure my colleagues that I speak for a truly grateful people who fully appreciate the wonderful privilege of being full-fledged citizens of this greatest Nation on earth.

The enthusiasm with which the House passed the bill for Hawaiian statehood was matched only by the enthusiasm of the people of Hawaii for statehood.

Hawaii first petitioned for statehood more than half a century before it was admitted to the Union. The first such petition was presented to Congress in 1903. In that year, the territorial legislature passed a joint resolution asking that Congress pass legislation which would enable Hawaii to become a State. The Island legislature presented at least 16 such petitions to Congress before statehood was finally granted.

The resolutions for statehood passed so many times by the territorial legislature represented the eagerness of the people of Hawaii to participate in the political life of the United States. But a more direct and dramatic expression of the popular wish for statehood was made by the people on the street when they signed the so-called statehood honor roll. This great roll of newsprint paper, 6 feet wide a mile long, which bears the signatures of the 116,000 Hawaiians who petitioned Congress for statehood, was presented to the President of the Senate on February 26, 1954. It rests now in the National Archives together with the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution, and like these two great human documents represents an affirmation of man's right to self-government.

That one out of every five citizens in Hawaii stood in line, many for hours, to sign the honor roll attests to the same public spirit with which the people of Hawaii fulfilled their public obligations, even while being denied the exercise of the rights and privileges of first-class citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that as a State, Hawaii is giving a unique and indis-

pensable kind of support to America's position of free world leadership, a kind of support which Hawaii alone can give.

Hawaii serves not merely as a military outpost of America in the Pacific. Face to face with communism in Asia, Hawaii serves to exemplify to the peoples of Asia the principle of liberty and the ideal of fraternity.

Communism holds out to the peoples of Asia the ideal of fraternity as a goal which can be achieved only through scientific and technological development. But the Communists undertake scientific and technical progress only by means of the total subordination of the individual to collective planning by the State and only by means of utter disregard to personal rights and liberties. The Communists seek to realize fraternity through enforced sacrifice of individual liberty.

Hawaii demonstrates to the peoples of Asia that both fraternity and technological progress can be achieved through free exercise of individual liberty.

In Hawaii, individual liberty and scientific progress go hand in hand. The peoples of Asia can see progress in experimental research in Hawaii as a representation of the human mind itself and as a reflection of the freedom of the mind which is indispensable for progress.

Hawaiian scientists are on the frontier of experimental research in several areas—in biomedicine and oceanography, in volcanology, which is the study of volcanoes and volcanic lava, in sugar and pineapple production, and hopefully, in the near future, in tropical and subtropical agriculture.

Biomedical research teams are exploiting the special possibilities which Hawaii offers for the study of medicinal plants. There are certain medicinal plants which will grow only in a tropical or subtropical climate, and these do well in Hawaii.

Researchers in Hawaii are pursuing medically valuable studies of fermentation processes. Sugar is Hawaii's biggest crop, and large amounts of sugar or molasses are needed to produce by means of fermentation such products as alcohols, organic acids, cortisone, and many antibiotics.

And scientists in biomedicine are making significant contributions to our knowledge of organ, tissue, and cell culture.

The people of Hawaii come from a variety of racial backgrounds. Few scientists have as much opportunity as do medical researchers in Hawaii to study correlations between ethnic background and human physiology. And researchers in the Pacific Biomedical Research Center are likely to make tremendous contributions to medical knowledge of diseases peculiar to Pacific and Asian areas. It should, with proper support and nurture develop into an internationally recognized center.

Another area in which Hawaii is providing national leadership is oceanography. Dr. George W. Woollard, director of the Geophysics Institute of the University of Hawaii, says that Hawaii offers better opportunities for oceanographic research than does any place on the mainland of the United States. Ha-

waiian waters are clear; around the islands are both shallow areas and water more than 18,000 feet deep; Hawaiian waters move in unusual currents formed by the configuration of the islands; and the climate is warm and steady so that research can go on without interruption all year round.

Research men are presently planning to construct manned underwater laboratories off the coast of the island of Oahu. The U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries undertakes programs of research in its laboratory in Honolulu. Other experimental studies are conducted by the University of Hawaii and the Environmental Science Services Administration. Private industry is also doing experimental, oceanographic research in Hawaii. Some of the corporations which have undertaken such studies are the Bissett-Berman Corp., Ocean Science & Engineering, Inc., Ling-Tempco-Vought, Inc., the Lockheed Corp., and Alpine Geophysical Associates.

In still another scientific area the department of soils and chemistry of the University of Hawaii has performed valuable, experimental research with volcanic lava. The research which university scientists have done has made it possible to reclaim land inundated by volcanic lava and to use this land to grow such valuable crops as papaya, guava, acerola cherries, and macadamia nuts. There are now hundreds of acres of macadamia nut orchards on lava land near Hilo on the island of Hawaii.

Scientists in Hawaii have also performed remarkably in sugar research at their experiment station in Honolulu. The experiment station is generously supported by the sugar growers of Hawaii. Researchers have, comparatively speaking, eliminated sugar losses caused by pests and diseases, and have developed new varieties of cane. As a result of experimental work with sugar, growers in Hawaii produce in excess of two times the normal yield of sugar per acre in any other area.

Researchers at the Pineapple Research Institute also have performed distinguished experimental work. Among other achievements, researchers at the Institute developed DDT as a soil fumigant.

Hawaii appears to be the most advantageous site for the establishment of the research center in tropical and subtropical agriculture which is provided for under the Food for Peace Act of 1966. It is prepared to assume this important role to aid the developing nations in the Pacific Basin and elsewhere.

Hawaii thus demonstrates to the peoples of Asia that liberty and scientific progress go hand in hand.

More than this, Hawaii demonstrates that liberty and fraternity also go hand in hand.

We in Hawaii come from many races and from different continents. Some of us are ethnically Hawaiian; some are of western origin; some are of Japanese descent; and others are of Filipino, Chinese, and Korean stock.

Racial discrimination is virtually unknown among us. The Hawaii Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission reported in 1961 that it had had

"no requests of any kind for action or assistance in the field of civil rights" and that it "knows of no instance in Hawaii which calls for enforcement of any laws on civil rights." In Hawaii, we respect every person as a person regardless of race.

Mr. Speaker, the East-West Center of the University of Hawaii, which Congress established in 1960, makes possible the introduction of graduate students and scholars from Asian and Pacific countries to American values and ideas. The Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West likewise gives opportunity to American students and scholars to acquire new understanding of the cultures of Asian and Pacific peoples. The University of Hawaii is in a uniquely advantageous position to provide a meeting place for men and women who are likely to assume places of public leadership in their own countries in years to come. Of particular interest in the curriculum of the East-West Center is "the Asia-America program," which is described as follows in the University of Hawaii catalog for 1966 to 1967:

The Asia-American Program presents lectures and seminars . . . on an intercultural and interdisciplinary basis which are required of all [East-West Center] students. It further organizes group field study for Asian students on the United States mainland, providing professional staff for orientation and interpretation of the United States to Asian participants.

And when Asian students who have seen America for themselves as members of field-study groups return to the center, they participate in an Asia-America seminar in order to discuss their experiences. The purpose of the seminar is described as follows:

Evaluation by Asian students of their American experiences and by American students of their Asian experiences. This seminar offers a forum for a free exchange of ideas and impressions gained in the field study program.

I think it is true to say, Mr. Speaker, that Hawaii is making a unique contribution not only to America's social progress, but also to the defense of liberty everywhere.

This, in brief, is the record of the 50th State during the 8 short years since the date of passage by this august body of the Hawaii statehood bill. While Hawaii presents that record with justifiable pride, she also looks to the future with confidence and welcomes the challenge of proving herself ever worthy to take her place among the other 49 great States to make up the United States of America.

FREDERIC COHEN—EMINENT NEW YORK MUSICIAN

Mr. RYAN. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Frederic

Cohen, beloved neighbor, constituent of mine, composer, and former director of the Juilliard Opera Theater, died Friday in New York. The loss of Mr. Cohen far transcends the particular compositions he has left for future generations to enjoy and to study. His humanity and his inspiring influences as an educator on succeeding generations of young musicians was indeed a major contribution in itself.

Mr. Speaker, Frederic Cohen was a man of parts. His career holds many inspiring moments. He grew up and studied music in Germany where he was born. Eventually he began conducting opera in municipal theaters and finally became director of the Essen Opera Theater. The Nazis dismissed him from this post in 1933.

After that Frederic Cohen fled Germany with his friend, Kurt Jooss, who was the director of a ballet company for which Mr. Cohen had written his masterful score "The Green Table." Together they went to England where Mr. Jooss started another ballet company of which Frederic Cohen was the musical director for the next 8 years.

In 1941 he came to the United States to continue his illustrious career in America. During World War II he taught music at Black Mountain and Kenyon Colleges. In 1945 he became secretary of the International Society for Contemporary Music, and in 1951 its president. His devotion to furthering contemporary music in America was deep and lasted for the rest of his life. He managed singlehandedly to bring the operas of many of his fellow composers to the public and to his students as well.

In 1946, Frederic Cohen became director of the Juilliard Opera Theater where he remained until 1963 when he retired because of illness. During his tenure there, he offered American premieres of operas by Britten, Dallapiccola, Strauss, Hindemith, Kodaly, as well as a lesser known work of Mozart. This alone was a major contribution to the American opera repertoire, but the training he gave to the students who have gone on to careers in vocal music was revered and valued by all—including those who have gone on to stardom.

During this time he was guest conductor and later acting director of the opera department at the Berkshire Music Center in Lenox, Mass., where he again brought new works to the public ear.

Frederic Cohen also, among his many activities, made a comprehensive survey during 1952 to 1954 of opera in the United States for the Juilliard Musical Foundation and the Metropolitan Opera Association. His conclusions were published in 1957 in the fall edition of the Juilliard Review. They included far-reaching recommendations that the Metropolitan Opera endorse a training system for lyric stage artists, a system of regional opera theaters in America, a university opera chain, an annual American festival of opera, etc.

Mr. Speaker, Frederic Cohen was known to me as a human being worthy of the highest tribute. Of those who knew him in his field, however, perhaps the most eloquent comment I have heard

was quoted in the New York Times of Monday, March 13. According to the Times, William Shuman, former president of Juilliard and present president of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts said yesterday:

Frederic Cohen was a distinguished man of the lyric theater. In the years I knew him at the Juilliard School of Music he inspired in all his students, many of whom are now established artists, a sense of mission. His artistic integrity and enthusiasm were uncompromising and an example to all who worked with him. His persistent courage in the face of debilitating illness was an inspiration which we, his colleagues, can never forget.

Mr. Speaker, we who knew Frederic Cohen in any way will remember him as someone who made our lives richer both personally and by enhancing the cultural life of whatever place in the world he happened to be.

DMSO, THE PERSECUTED DRUG

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT] 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my interest in promoting free clinical testing of DMSO under the supervision of physicians, I call the attention of Congress to an interview with Dr. Jean K. Weston, vice president of the National Pharmaceutical Council, Inc. The interview was given in Portland, Oreg., and was reported by Ann Sullivan. Here is her story:

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 16, 1967]

PHARMACEUTICAL COUNCIL OFFICIAL RAPS FOOD, DRUG AGENCY LIMITS ON DMSO TESTS

(By Ann Sullivan)

Difficult requirements for pre-clearance of experimental work on dimethyl sulfoxide have been set by the overworked and undermanned Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Jean K. Weston, vice president of the National Pharmaceutical Council, Inc., said in Portland Tuesday.

Dr. Weston, both an M.D. and Ph.D., with a long record of research and teaching at Temple University, was in Portland briefly to confer with state medical and pharmaceutical leaders and to make a talk at the University of Oregon Medical School.

The drug DMSO which figured in clinical bans by FDA a year ago, then was returned to limited testing at the beginning of this year, is expected to be back on prescription in Europe this spring.

Weston said in his opinion, when the New York Academy of Sciences meeting of March 1966, showed so much "of promise" in the unusual chemical, that the testing of it should have been stepped up rather than shut off at that time.

QUESTION POSED

"I would hope they could go ahead and find out what DMSO is good for. Certainly the New York meeting demonstrated enough interesting areas of further study. Why should this be stopped?"

Requiring all further studies planned on DMSO to be precleared by the FDA commissioner, Dr. Weston said, is not spelled out for

drugs in either the congressional amendments of 1962, nor the FDA regulations which followed.

Dr. Weston said if he were advising pharmaceutical firms interested in further testing under these requirements, he would say: "Don't do this. It is setting up a precedent, without going through the law or the regulations."

His Oregon mission Tuesday was the gathering and dissemination of information in regard to new national legislation in the hopper which includes "generic" drug references.

It is Dr. Weston's opinion that these amendments expanding benefits of Titles 18 and 19, some of which carry language restricting the right of physicians to prescribe drugs other than by their generic name, are all based "on a fundamentally inaccurate idea."

EFFECTS VARY

The idea, "That if you put a generic name—the chemical agent—on a drug, that you can be sure of its therapeutic effect. This is not true. You can take the same chemical and grind one batch of it twice as long as another and come out with two different effects," he said.

"The physical characteristics can vary widely." Additions of preservatives, excipient (ingredient to make it run more smoothly), and methods of manufacture, including purity standards, all vary and often can modify the result, he said.

Even penicillin varies between drug manufacturers, said Dr. Weston. Public health standards require 85 per cent purity, yet some top pharmaceutical firms voluntarily set their own standards at 99 per cent.

Some of the physicians at the meeting at the Oregon Medical Association agreed that they themselves know of differing effects from different products.

Dr. Weston said he was in sympathy with the Food and Drug Administration for its problems.

"They were given an important job to do with the 1962 amendments. But they didn't have adequate staff. They still don't. As a result of the hasty legislation, they can't do the job. Dr. James Goddard has said he will try."

Dr. Weston pointed out that approximately 400 new drug applications have been on file with FDA for a long time.

DELAYS SEEN

"We don't know how many drugs are hung up there. They tell us that is confidential information."

He and Dr. Elton McCawley of the University of Oregon Medical School pointed out two "excellent" drugs, Indocin (antirheumatic) and Zylprim (antigout) which were available abroad long before here.

Dr. McCawley pointed out that a number of major American manufacturers are building plants and research laboratories in other countries, naming Mexico City for one.

"Should I learn Spanish?" he quipped.

A study released two weeks ago show that the number of prescription drug products introduced in 1966 dropped to 80 from 112 the year before. Over a 10-year period, the number of new medicines approved by FDA for marketing has declined 80 per cent.

Sharpest decline was in the number of single new chemical agents. The figure reached a new low of 12 after a high of 63 in 1959.

The study, by Paul deHaen, Inc., of New York City, also showed the American drug industry marketed seven new single chemical agents in other countries which were not available in the United States. The number introduced in the United States was lower than in any of the four major countries of Western Europe.

France marketed 34; Germany, 42; Great Britain, 20 and Italy, 21. One-third of these were developed by American scientists.

OREGON HIGHWAY FUND CUTBACK PROTESTED

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT] 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken out in the past about the unjustified and legally dubious cutback in highway funds by this administration. The devious use and misuse of these already dedicated revenues has been protested by many Members of this body.

Officials in State and local government are concerned. The President's arbitrary cut in dedicated moneys, moneys that should go to improve our highway system and save lives, is a shocking example of lack of foresight. Many of the wasteful Great Society programs can be cut, yet the needed highways are left to go begging.

Oregon highway officials are among the many people shocked at the administration's action. A slight thaw in the fund freeze has been a misleading token promise that takes on the appearance of a tree that shows a few blossoms, but never bears fruit.

Oregon's highway program has been one of the Nation's most advanced. It must continue moving forward in order to keep pace with the growth of the State. This will not be possible without the full use of the allotted, dedicated Federal highway funds.

Concern over this situation in the State highway department is rising. I would like to present at this time a statement I have received from Oregon State Highway Engineer Forrest Cooper, outlining Oregon's position on the Federal highway fund cutback:

STATEMENT RE OREGON'S POSITION ON THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY CUTBACK

(By Forrest Cooper)

The position of the Oregon State Highway Commission with respect to the recently announced federal highway cutback and the threatened further cutback is as follows:

(1) We object to the cutback because of the disruption it will cause to Oregon's badly needed highway program.

(2) We object to the cutback from the standpoint of public safety. With great emphasis being placed on highway safety by the Federal Government, it seems an inconsistent position for the Government to reduce funds for improvements which have proven to add materially to highway safety.

(3) We object to the retroactive provisions of the cutback, as we feel they are unfair.

(4) We object to the uncertainty created by the drastic cutback and the proposed cutback, as it is impossible to properly plan future construction programs due to the uncertainty as to when, if ever, cuts will be restored.

(5) We object to the cutback because of the serious disruptions it will cause to the construction industry which, in good faith, tooled and staffed for the efficient completion of the federal highway program.

Highway construction in Oregon, as in many other states, is largely done on a seasonal basis. Doling out money in quarters at the whim of the Federal Government

makes it impossible to efficiently plan, contract, and prosecute work. We feel that it is time the waste and confusion caused by erratic federal financing should be ended, so that the states may proceed in an orderly and economical manner to improve the highway systems.

POLLUTION CONTROL IN WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT] 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration recently released a "Summary Report on Water Quality Control and Management for the Willamette River Basin." This report was given to the press and received wide publicity in Oregon.

Last Friday I received a copy of a letter by the chief engineer of the Oregon State Sanitary Authority to Oregon's Governor, Tom McCall.

I am deeply disturbed by the conflict between the Federal agency and our State authority as revealed by this letter.

In this day of rapidly increasing involvement of the Federal Government in the lives of each of us it is of the utmost importance that there be extremely close cooperation between our State and Federal Governments. This is particularly true in connection with both air and water pollution problems.

The correspondence to which I refer indicates a lack of coordination, and what is really shocking to me an absence even of bare communication. The Federal agency refused even to give our State agency an advance copy of the report, with the advice that the State would have to wait to read about it in the newspapers. This procedure raises political overtones.

Mr. Speaker I am asking for an explanation of this breakdown in communications and lack of coordination. I would appeal to both of these government agencies to each go more than halfway in this regard, so that the cooperative effort of both can maximize the progress of solving this important problem.

The letter to which I have referred follows:

OREGON STATE SANITARY AUTHORITY,
Portland, Oreg., March 6, 1967.

Hon. TOM MCCALL,
Governor, State of Oregon,
State Capitol,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR GOVERNOR MCCALL: As chief engineer of Oregon's official water pollution control program, I feel compelled to comment on the "Summary Report on Water Quality Control and Management for the Willamette River Basin" which was released the other day by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

I must comment on it because in my opinion it represents an extremely biased and slanted evaluation of the State's water pollution control program. Because of the fallacies which it contains it approaches professional dishonesty.

It misleads the reader into believing that the present water quality conditions are critical, that they are continually getting worse, that the State's pollution control program is inadequate, that no real progress has been made in the past. These are all gross misrepresentations of the actual conditions.

First of all it should be pointed out that although much of the report pertains to and severely criticizes the program of the State Sanitary Authority, we were not given a copy of the report until after it had been headlined on the front pages of the local newspapers on Monday, February 27, 1967. As a consequence, we were unable to comment on it when contacted by representatives of the press on Friday, February 24. We had previously been informed that it was to be released, but when we asked for an advance copy the Portland office of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration advised that we would have to wait and read about it in the newspapers.

The Sanitary Authority would be the first to admit that the job of pollution control in the Willamette Basin is far from done, that it will be a continual battle to maintain high water quality standards, that the Authority's present program needs to be accelerated and strengthened, and that the support of the general public is essential to the success of such a program. We will never admit, however, that it is necessary to misrepresent actual conditions, to distort the facts, to exaggerate deficiencies, to resort to such devious means to get headlines in order to gain public support.

I will point out some of the statements made in the report that cannot be supported by factual evidence and therefore must be considered as false.

On page 4 it is stated that "bacterial contamination limits the sources for domestic, municipal and food processing water supplies." That definitely is not true. It is stated further that an "oxygen block" in Portland harbor "prevents the latter stages of the spring migration of salmon upstream." That likewise is not true. It is claimed that as a result of this oxygen block there is a reduction of the spawning population due to predation and other causes. The Oregon State Fish Commission has no evidence to support either that statement or the belief that a high mortality occurs among downstream migrants as a result of pollution in the Portland harbor.

The lead paragraph of the Foreword is a good example of how the report misleads the reader into believing that present river conditions are much worse than they actually are. It would have the reader believe, for example, that the gross pollution which existed some 20 or 30 years ago still exists today. Contrary to the impression given in that paragraph the main Willamette, as the result of construction of upstream sewage treatment plants, is today again being used as a source of public water supply and during the summer is heavily used for recreation including water skiing. The lead paragraph's final statement that "spawning areas for that large portion of the Pacific salmon run that is based upon the Willamette have deteriorated with persistence of pollution" cannot be supported by factual evidence and therefore is also false.

Under the program of the State Sanitary Authority, 108 communities (cities, sanitary districts and other entities) in the Willamette Basin are already operating secondary sewage treatment plants. The report on page 6 mentions only 74 such plants. Of the nine cities that still have only primary treatment, five already have secondary treatment units under construction, a sixth one opened bids last month and so will shortly award a contract for construction of secondary facilities, a seventh is planning to start construction as soon as revised plans can be completed by the consulting engineers, and the other two

discharge to the Columbia River rather than to the Willamette, and so are not in immediate need of a higher degree of treatment. These latter two are Portland and Gresham.

Page 2 of the report presents the recommendations of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration for immediate pollution abatement and for long-term pollution control.

Recommendation No. 1 for immediate control of pollution caused by pulp mill wastes specifies that the equivalent of primary and secondary treatment (85% BOD removal) is to be provided within five years for the five sulphite mills located in the basin. The program of the Sanitary Authority specifies that such requirements shall be met before the low stream flow period of 1968. The report makes no mention of the fact that facilities for the removal of floating and settleable solids (primary treatment) were installed in 1966 for the Lebanon mill, are already under construction at the West Linn and Newberg mills, and during 1967 will be under construction at the Oregon City and Salem mills. Likewise no mention is made of the fact that during the low stream flow period of 1966 the BOD of these pulp mill waste loads discharged to the main river were reduced by 87 to 94 percent at Salem, 88 to 89 percent at Newberg, 69 to 74 percent at Oregon City, and 73 to 76 percent at West Linn. The report gives the casual reader the impression that the pulp mills have thus far done little or nothing to reduce their pollution loads.

Of the eleven communities mentioned in Recommendation No. 2 as being required to install within the next five years new or improved secondary treatment works, two (Mt. Angel and Sweet Home) have already completed their projects, two (Cottage Grove and Harrisburg) are presently under construction, one (Junction City) has recently opened bids for construction, and five others (Albany, Monroe, Oakridge, Dallas and Fannon Creek) are expected to be under construction before the end of 1967. The other one (McMinnville) already provides secondary treatment and is not in immediate need of improvement.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration contends that because the lower Willamette is subject to the ebb and flow of the tide that portion of the river comes within the definition of "coastal water" and therefore is subject to the provisions of the 1965 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act regarding the establishment of water quality standards. It is difficult for us to believe that Congress intended that such waters which are more than 100 miles from the ocean should be classified as "coastal waters." This is a matter which we believe should be strongly contested by all coastal states.

Even though we do not admit that any part of the Willamette is interstate water, we are in the process of establishing specific water quality standards for all of the main stem as well as Multnomah Channel. A public hearing for considering the standards being proposed by the Sanitary Authority has been scheduled for March 23, 1967, here in Portland. The proposed standards "clearly recognize the importance of the river system as a spawning area for anadromous salmonid fish and support the expansion of recreational and water supply capabilities of the basin's waters" as specified in the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration Recommendation No. 3 for immediate pollution abatement.

With regard to Recommendation No. 1 for long term pollution control, the Sanitary Authority and its staff have for many years been promoting the area-wide or regional approach to solving pollution control problems. The so-called tri-county master sewer system in the Portland metropolitan area, the Salem master sewer system and the proposed Bear Creek Valley project are all the result of these

efforts in not only the Willamette Basin, but the entire state.

With reference to the report's Recommendation No. 4 for long term pollution control, no mention is made of or credit given to the Sanitary Authority for having conducted since 1950 a comprehensive monitoring program in the Willamette Basin. This program which has been greatly expanded in recent years will be further improved this next biennium if the 1967 Legislature approves our request for increased staff and budget. It includes regular and frequent (daily during the low stream flow period) surveillance of the river conditions at several selected sampling stations, submission of monthly reports from cities and industries (weekly from the pulp mills during the summer) regarding waste loads discharged to the river, and as frequently as possible surveys or checks by Sanitary Authority personnel of waste treatment plant operations and efficiencies. This monitoring program of the Authority should be more than adequate to maintain effective control of the water quality in the Willamette Basin in the years ahead.

Although we have no intention of defending the city of Portland for being so slow in completing its sewerage works project, we believe it is only fair to point out that since 1947 the residents of Portland have spent more than \$31,000,000 for sewage collection and treatment. In 1966 alone contracts totaling in excess of \$4,600,000 were awarded by the city. At the present time approximately 94 percent of the total dry weather flow of both domestic sewage and industrial wastes produced within the city is being collected and satisfactorily treated at either the main Columbia River primary plant or the city's new and smaller Tryon Creek secondary plant which discharges to the Willamette. The city has promised to complete the interception of and to provide adequate treatment for the other 6 percent of its total sewage and waste load by 1968. Additional improvements costing several millions of dollars will of course be required over the next few years by the city of Portland to handle future load increases and eventually to upgrade the treatment of the effluents discharged to the Columbia River.

There is nothing unusual or surprising about the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration's estimate of \$105,000,000 as the cost of water pollution control projects that may be needed during the next 20 years. The actual needs will of course depend upon the amount of population growth and industrial development that takes place during that period. It should be noted that the communities and industries in the basin have spent at least that amount since World War II for sewage and waste collection and disposal.

My last comment regarding the federal report is that it took them an awfully long time to complete it. The federal agency has had the responsibility for developing comprehensive water pollution control programs since 1956.

It has been studying the Willamette Basin intensively since 1961. The first draft of the Willamette report was prepared some two and one-half years ago. Why was it released at this particular time? Most of the factual information which it contains was obtained from the Sanitary Authority. We have been engaged for quite some time in carrying out most of the program which they now recommend.

I apologize for the length of this letter, but I thought it important to bring this matter to your attention, particularly since the local newspapers appear to have joined the federal agency's bandwagon.

If you should desire any further details, please feel free to request them.

Sincerely,

KENNETH H. SPIES,
Secretary and Chief Engineer,
State Sanitary Authority.

TO PROVIDE CREDIT FOR STATE AND CITY INCOME TAX

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide for a Federal income tax credit for payments for State and local income taxes.

This legislation will help produce the answer to New York State's fiscal problems. Under the legislation I propose, New York State will be able to raise its taxes, and the Federal Government—and not the taxpayers of New York State—will pick up the tab. My bill would also provide a credit for any city income tax.

Under my legislation, New York State and New York City will be able to get the extra revenues they will need in years to come, although I believe that New York's needs will also be reduced by the great financial success of the lottery about to be established in New York.

Under the Fino tax credit bill, our States and cities will be able to institute or raise income taxes to get more money without this money coming out of the pockets of the people. The Federal Government will be surrendering some of its revenues back to the States so that the States will be able to conduct programs without running to Washington for money. The dollars that are spent in the States will go further than the dollars spent by the Federal Government, hopefully, because they will not have to pay for a roundtrip to Washington, and resultant shrinkage.

This is a measure in support of waning federalism. Today, when the Federal Government is seeking to saddle our cities and States with "Federal coordinators" or "commissars" to supervise Federal programs, I think it is important to provide the financial wherewithal for the return of these programs to the States without Federal control.

Federal tax credits for payment of State income taxes would have several advantages. It would encourage all States to resort to state income taxes, aiming for much greater tax uniformity. It would also mean, as I have said, that the States and not the Federal Government would decide just what should be done with the revenues they raise. Nor would there be any danger that revenues would be cut off in a recession, which means that States could be in a position to maintain their expenditures.

This idea is not a panacea. I would worry that some States might institute excessive income taxes so as to get vast slush funds. They might be able to get away with this because the people of the State would not be hurt, just the Federal Government. Obviously, there has to be some kind of limit on the credit that can be given.

As a start, I propose that the Federal income tax credit for State income tax be limited to an amount which shall not exceed 20 percent of the Federal income

tax paid. This will give real meaning to the idea of creative federalism.

TOWARD DEVELOPMENT IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States will soon be leaving to represent this Nation at one of the Western Hemisphere's most important international gatherings of the 20th century—the meeting of American Chiefs of State, to be held at Punta del Este, Uruguay, from April 12 to 14.

In the spirit of the joint resolution now before this Congress to support the other American Republics as we together inaugurate this historic new phase of the Alliance for Progress, I take this occasion to wish President Johnson and the members of his delegation Godspeed, and to express the sincere hope that he and his colleagues, the Presidents of our neighbor nations, may enjoy all success in carrying out the tremendous mission which they have undertaken.

This mission, Mr. Speaker, is no less than the furtherance of the welfare and prosperity of 200 million of the world's people—a 200 million who, if present rates of growth continue, will be 650 million by the year 2000. It also involves the development and modernization of a great continent, a continent which finds itself in many respects in the same dynamic condition of rapid expansion and economic "takeoff" which marked these United States in the early years of the 20th century.

Nowhere in Latin America is this comparison with our own Nation's period of most rapid development more evident than in the agricultural areas of South America. Throughout these vast lands rivers are being dammed, bridged, and diverted; swamps are being drained; jungles cleared; forests planted; lakes created. Mountains are being blasted, and roads are being driven deep into the heartland of the continent. Indeed, Latin America may to a great extent bypass one of the most dramatic eras of North America's expansion into the interior, the thrust westward of our railroads.

Air transportation is rapidly supplanting the iron horse as the most efficient and economical means in the mid-20th century of opening what have been called the "inner frontiers" of these territories. The airplane, the superhighway, and the farm-to-market road provide the transportation pattern of the future there, and the areas which are being opened up resemble in many ways portions of the North American West as they existed during the closing years of the 19th century. There are very large and isolated rural areas. The terrain is difficult, and surprisingly large por-

tions of the best habitable areas have scarcely been developed at all, so difficult is the access.

Mr. Speaker, it is our privilege as Americans to assist our neighbor nations as they confront these great frontiers of theirs; to assist them in the same spirit of mutual respect, appreciation, and admiration shown to us during the corresponding period of our own development. For the past 6 years we have been doing this through the instrumentality of the Alliance for Progress, the farsighted and far-ranging program adopted by the governments of the American States in 1961 to unite the efforts of all their peoples in order to accelerate the economic and social development of Latin America.

At the summit meeting in Punta del Este President Johnson and his colleagues will rededicate themselves to the gigantic tasks remaining if the human dreams and practical goals envisaged by the Alliance are to be realized. To this historic effort we pledge our full support.

FHA INSURANCE FOR SEASONAL HOMES

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to authorize FHA insurance for the construction of seasonal homes. At a time when family use of second and vacation homes is increasing rapidly and when new housing starts are dropping off due to tight money, such legislation is badly needed.

This bill has already received extensive consideration in the other body. It was included as title I of S. 3711 which passed on August 12, 1966. However, it was ruled not germane to the conference which considered the House substitute for S. 3711 because its provisions had not been included in the House bill. I would hope that, because of this previous attention to the matter, we can move forward promptly here in the 90th Congress.

Under the terms of my bill, section 203 of the National Housing Act would be amended to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to insure mortgages on single-family dwellings, whether or not designed for year-round occupancy. The mortgage, to be eligible, would not involve a principle obligation in excess of \$15,000 and could not be in excess of 75 percent of the appraised value of the property.

The Secretary would be authorized to waive many of the requirements now considered essential for the insuring of mortgages in urban areas of high population density, but could insist that the development of the property is to be "consistent with the conservation of water and other natural resources of the area." This provision can help us avoid

haphazard development of our remaining open spaces.

In my judgment, this legislation provides us with an opportunity to stimulate a healthy development in our economy. I urge its prompt enactment.

WHOSE CONSULATES WILL SPEAK FOR THESE?

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 1966, the Chicago Tribune carried an article by its middle Europe correspondent, Clyde Farnsworth entitled: "250,000 Still in Red Slave Camps." The story related the successful attempt by the Polish division of Radio Free Europe to have returned to their homeland thousands of Poles exiled to the Soviet Union during and after World War II. In 1955 Radio Free Europe began broadcasting into Poland the names of Poles still in Soviet camps according to the information supplied by nearly 4,000 German POW's returned to Germany due to an agreement between Chancellor Adenauer and the Soviets. Of course, the Polish Government stated that there were no more Polish citizens in Soviet camps. After several months of broadcasting, more and more Polish listeners began questioning the Polish Government, and even Russian soldiers, observers, and advisers then stationed in Poland. With a growing uneasiness among the Polish populace, the Polish Communist authorities in October 1955, announced that Poles were returning from the U.S.S.R. and that more would be repatriated. By 1959 approximately 125,000 Poles had been freed from Soviet camps.

Since 1959 the Polish division of Radio Free Europe has been assembling information on other inmates of Soviet camps. Radio Free Europe, in February 1966, estimated that approximately 250,000 prisoners are being held by the Soviets which include, in addition to additional Polish inmates, Czechs, Hungarians, Germans, Russians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Finns, Jews, Bulgarians, Rumanians, and Kalmuks.

In view of the correctness of Radio Free Europe's first charge and the subsequent return of approximately 125,000 Poles, this second allegation, as recent as February of last year, should be investigated before any further consideration is given to a Consular Convention, a Fiat automotive deal, or increased trade with the Soviet Union, and its other Eastern Communist cohorts.

If this latter charge is factual, as the first one turned out to be, to what consular office in the Soviet Union can these imprisoned Rumanians, Poles, Latvians, and the others take their cases?

Of special significance during this building bridges era is a recommendation made by the Subcommittee on Eu-

rope of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in its reports in 1963 on the Captive European Nations:

The Committee believes that we can achieve diplomatic and strategic gains in the cold war if we pursue our objectives with vigor and determination. The Soviets push every advantage, and exploit every weakness of the free world. We should push every advantage, and exploit every weakness of the Communist bloc. In this respect, while the captive nations add some strength to the Soviet Union, it must be remembered that they are captive nations, seeking to regain their freedom at the earliest opportunity. As such they constitute large areas of vulnerability for the Soviet Union. We must always remember that our support for the legitimate objectives of liberty and self-determination for these friendly peoples may exploit a woefully weak spot in the Soviet system.

The forthrightness of the Polish division of Radio Free Europe in Munich is an excellent example of the good that can accrue in pursuing a just and honorable cause. Over 100,000 human beings would in all probability still be languishing in Soviet camps if no one had had the integrity and solicitude to speak for them. The elected officials of the United States, the land of the free and the brave, can raise their voices calling for investigation and review of the Polish division's charge of the wholesale enslavement of one-quarter of a million human souls. Legislation proposing that the issue of self-determination for the Captive Nations be placed on the agenda of the U.N. has been before Congress for a number of years. The State Department, in a report on this legislation which I requested, true to form, opposed it. Included in this legislation was the proposal of "returning to their respective homelands all political prisoners and exiles now in slave labor and prison camps."

Although I will again introduce this legislation this year, it is nevertheless depressing that the United States is so willing to do business with the oppressors while totally ignoring the oppressed. The United States can truly be a worldwide consulate for the oppressed by bringing this issue to universal attention.

I include the article, "250,000 Still in Red Slave Camps," from the Chicago Tribune of May 8, 1966, in the RECORD at this point:

EXCLUSIVE: A REPORT ON POW'S IN THE U.S.S.R.: 250,000 STILL IN RED SLAVE CAMPS—POLES, TERM OVER, KEPT ON TO LABOR

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

VIENNA.—There is reason to suppose that a quarter million Poles and other foreign nationals are still slaving in Soviet work camps, more than 20 years after the end of World War II.

This number and the names of some prisoners, along with the location of their camps, have been revealed by the Polish Division of Radio Free Europe, which has collected the information over a period of years.

Today, while the Polish Communist regime is trying to attract Polish exiles in the West back to their homeland, Radio Free Europe is telling the Polish people again about the fate of thousands of their countrymen in the Soviet Union.

GRIM STORY OF COLD WAR

Behind this campaign and the shocking estimate of the number of lives involved lies

an involved but grimly fascinating story of the cold war.

The last time news of large-scale Soviet detention of Polish nationals came to attention was in 1955, when Radio Free Europe broadcast a series of programs about Soviet prison camps based on information supplied by returned German prisoners of war.

The release of the Germans had been prompted by the then Federal Chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, who told the Soviet Government that there could be no normalization of relations between Bonn and Moscow until all Germans had been returned from Soviet prisoner of war camps.

EX-PRISONERS AID CAUSE

When the Soviets responded, and German prisoners began to return early in 1955, Radio Free Europe officials compiled a list of the returnees that eventually included almost 4,000 names. To these men a questionnaire was sent, appealing for the names, descriptions, and other pertinent details about fellow prisoners from other countries who were still being detained.

The purpose of the Radio Free Europe appeal—to effect the release of the other prisoners of war—was completely spelled out. And the response was considered remarkable. More than 90 percent of the former German prisoners filled out the questionnaires, and some took the trouble to visit Radio Free Europe headquarters in Munich to provide a firsthand description of their prison life.

DETAILS ARE LEARNED

From them Radio Free Europe gathered the name of prisoners from countries all over the world. Included were details about the prisoners' homes, their marital status, professions, the ages of their children, and so on.

These descriptions enabled Radio Free Europe to set up files on approximately 10,000 prisoners whose existence had been known by scarcely anyone but their Soviet jailers for a decade or more.

The names of those from Western countries were passed on to the governments concerned, usually through their embassies in Germany or through the International Red Cross.

The first Radio Free Europe broadcast campaign to release Polish prisoners was opened July 31, 1955.

DEMAND BY RADIO

Radio Free Europe's Polish language station director, Jan Nowak, told Polish listeners at that time:

"Germans, Austrians, and Italians—former soldiers of conquered enemy forces—are returning to their homes, while Poles remain in the depths of Russia because no one remembers them any longer or demands their return.

"We demand the return to the homeland of Poles in Soviet prisons and labor camps—Poles who are suffering and dying 10 years after the end of the war because they committed only one crime: They fought for independence."

For more than 7 months Radio Free Europe periodically broadcast the names of Poles and the prison camps where they were last known to have lived. The names were read at dictation speed so that listeners could write them down, along with any variations in spelling that might have occurred.

HELD IN SILENCE

According to the freed Germans, the Polish prisoners of war had not been allowed to write their families or communicate in any way to the outside world. As a result, many were presumed dead because they had been missing for so long. In many cases, the Radio Free Europe broadcasts gave the first indication that individual prisoners were indeed still alive.

The names and descriptions of the prison-

ers went out over the air in brief messages such as these:

"Walenty Kucharski, 30 years old, born in Sosnowiec; lieutenant in the Polish Army; deported to Vorkuta after the war; mine No. 29."

"Stefan Szymanski, 26 years old, from Lwow, arrested as a 16-year-old boy toward the end of 1945; has remained in camp No. 36 in the region of Vorkuta."

Response to the broadcasts was such that there could be no doubt they were making an impact. Letters were received from behind the Iron Curtain asking the station to repeat particular programs so certain names could be verified.

But few of the writers mentioned the names of those in whom they were interested for fear that the letters might be intercepted and the prisoners face a worse fate.

BROADCASTS ANNOY REDS

Ignored initially by the Polish Government, the broadcasts caused considerable embarrassment to local Communist officials who were questioned by residents about the validity of the charges. Until that time the party line had always been that the Soviet Union held no more Polish prisoners of war.

Poles took advantage of the presence of a great number of Russian soldiers, observers, and advisers to ask the same questions of them. In an attempt to halt the growing uneasiness, the Polish Government finally broke its 3-month silence to comment on the Radio Free Europe pronouncements.

On October 31, 1955, Radio Warsaw referred to "a certain number of repatriates from Russia" and noted a few weeks later that "Poles have been returning from the U.S.S.R. for several months now." It added, "We are certain that the number of returnees will increase in the near future."

MORE AND MORE REPATRIATED

The hope was given foundation by the rising number of prisoners being freed. Before the end of 1955, a total of 6,429 Poles were repatriated. The next year the figure jumped to 30,786, and in 1957, to a record 93,872.

Still in 1958—13 years after the war ended—85,865 Poles were returned from Soviet detention, and in 1959, 28,400 more.

The Polish Red Cross claimed that all except 15 percent of the 245,000 repatriated Poles were actually residents of the territory annexed by the Soviet Union after the war. They said that only about 36,000 were actually deportees.

Even so, the imprisonment of 36,000 nationals of a "fraternal" Communist country would seem to require a lot of explaining so many years after friendly relations had been established between them.

MANY QUIT PARADISE

And the fact that so many of the beneficiaries of Russia's postwar expansion had chosen to leave the Soviet paradise could hardly be comforting to communism's internationalist ideologists.

Observing the return of a group of prisoners from Russia in 1959, a Warsaw journalist said:

"Looking at them, I could not restrain my own tears. And from the crowd of onlookers came anti-Soviet shouts and curses again and again. 'Take those poor devils to Comrade Wieslaw [Wladyslaw Gomułka]. Let him see what the Soviets have done with these people.'"

What they had done was to make the prisoners repay their jailers by working as miners, lumbermen, roadbuilders, and farmers. In short, the Polish prisoners provided a cheap source of labor to the Communist "liberators" of Eastern Europe.

One of the first acknowledgments of the extent of Polish detention in Russia appeared on October 25, 1956, during the time of the Hungarian revolution. The paper Tygodnik Zachodni admitted that there had been official silence in Poland about the

"hundreds of thousands of Poles in Russia" and that this had given an excellent opportunity to "foreign radio stations" to conduct "an anti-Polish and anti-Soviet propaganda campaign."

PAPER GIVES ADVICE

It was time to speed up the repatriation of Poles from Russia, the paper added, suggesting that "a settlement of this humanitarian problem is in the interest of Polish-Soviet friendship and will also silence the 'Free Europe' broadcasts."

By mid-1959 the Polish Government was assuring everyone that "repatriation from the Soviet Union is complete." But Nowak and his fellow Polish exiles didn't believe that even a majority of their countrymen had been released from Soviet detention. They continued to search for further information.

Within a year they were convinced that additional thousands of Poles were still working in Soviet labor camps. And last February they decided that enough material had been gathered to open a new campaign to force the release of the remaining Polish prisoners.

A 45-minute special program on February 14 referred to the station's 1955-56 efforts and told of the new freedom drive that was being started. Typical Radio Free Europe programs described the various camps where Poles and other prisoners could be located.

"In the far north of the Soviet Union, near Lumbovka and its environs on the Kola peninsula in the Murmansk Oblast, Poles may be found among the 8,500 prisoners still held in three labor camps," the broadcast said.

STILL HELD CAPTIVE

"Some of the Poles are serving prison terms for alleged political offenses committed during and immediately after the war. Those who have served out their sentences still work under compulsion and are forbidden to leave the area."

"Among the prisoners held in Gandala," a later broadcast said, "there are Germans, Hungarians, and Poles, although the number and nationality of all the inmates are uncertain. They are employed in lumbering, in coal mining, and in the construction of rocket launching pads and sites, highways, railroads, hostels, and hotels."

WARSAW NOW SILENT

Although Radio Free Europe has made more than 40 broadcasts since February about the continued detention of Poles, the Warsaw government has again failed to comment on the matter. In view of the long delay in responding to the 1955-56 campaign, however, Radio Free Europe's Polish staff is not discouraged.

The station is still receiving information and further responses from Polish listeners giving details about imprisoned relatives and camps. And, at the start of the third decade of the postwar era, there is still hope for foreigners imprisoned in the Soviet Union.

LISTING OF 56 SOVIET FORCED LABOR CAMPS

1. Lumbovka: Mother camp.
- 2 and 3. Lumbovka subcamps, Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Germans, Russians—8,000 altogether, including women and children; mining of precious metals, construction of airfields, roads.
4. Another subcamp, liquidated because of epidemic.

LOCATED ON KOLA PENINSULA

5. Saborovo: Poles, Russians, a few Germans—total 5,000; mining of precious metals, building construction, road repairs.
6. Wykhodnoy: Poles, Latvians—around 3,000, including women; repairs to airfields, camp services.
7. Noska: In uninhabited area; little known about it.

LOCATED IN NOVAYA ZEMLYA AREA

- 8, 9, 10, 11. Vlermyensk Vorkuta, Izma, Shchugor, Ukhta: Poles, Germans—alto-

gether 6,000; construction of railroads, oil well drilling; terrible conditions, high mortality.

12. Berezniki: Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Germans—total unknown; heavy industry, manufacture of machinery.

13. Sukhobezvodnoye: Poles, Russians, a majority of Germans, a small number of Hungarians—total 2,000; heavy and chemical industries; forest clearing.

14. UFA: Poles from here transferred in 1958, fate unknown; Hungarians, Ukrainians, Russians, a few Alsatisians remain—total 5,000; iron ore mines.

15, 16, 17. Camps in Kirghizian steppes. Hungarians, Germans, Kalmuks, Russians—3,000 altogether; drilling of oil wells, railroad track maintenance.

18, 19, 20. Lemborskaya I, Lemborskaya II, Lemborskaya III: Poles, Hungarians, Germans, a small group of Finns—3,000 in each camp, including women and children; construction of factories, airfields, railroads, highways; oil well drilling, canal construction.

21. Ugor Kaukaski: Poles, Czechs, Jews—total 4,000; quarries, airfields.

22. Navyersk: Camp for the military. Nationalities unknown; 5,000 prisoners; quarrying, road construction, oil well drilling.

23. Tbilisi (Tiflis): Poles, Hungarians, Germans, Kalmuks, Russians—altogether 2,500, including women. Electric power-plant, airfields.

24. Voronyezh: Poles, Germans, many Turks; coal mining.

25. Dudina: Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Rumanians, Germans, including women—total 1,500; factories, road construction.

26. Kaluga: Poles, Baltic people, Russians—total 1,000; road construction, canal maintenance.

27. Yaroslavl: Not many Poles, mostly Hungarians. Germans—altogether 2,800; metallurgical factories, canal construction.

28. Kadluga: Camp for Soviet officers; lumbering.

29. Kamenets Podoisk: Poles, Hungarians, Ukrainians—altogether 1,500; construction of airfields, highways.

30. Pervomaysk: Small group of Poles, plus Hungarians, Russians—total 3,000 in 1960; factories, cement plants.

31. Krivoy Rog: Poles, Lithuanians, Hungarians, Germans, including women—altogether 2,400; cellulose factory, road construction.

32. Tobolsk: Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, including women; altogether 20 camps with 500 prisoners each; construction of railroads, highways; drilling of tunnels.

33. Enurmino: Estonians, Finns, Russians—altogether 6,600; various occupations, including construction of tunnels, airports.

34. Kurgam: Poles, Estonians, Russians—altogether 5,000; road construction.

35. Uka: Poles, Hungarians, Rumanians, women—altogether 6,000; drilling of mountain tunnels, railroad construction.

36. Ivashka: Nationality and occupations same as Uka; about 10,000 prisoners.

37, 38, 39, 40. Existence and location confirmed but no more details available; many prisoners sent here never return; official explanation is that, after serving sentences, they decide to settle there for good. [Located on Kamchatka Peninsula.]

41, 42. Darya I and IV: Subcamps: some Poles but mostly Germans, Kirghizians, Russians—altogether 14,500; tunnel, air field construction.

43. Kara-Kum: Camp for the military; also some Hungarians, Germans; prisoners dig canals.

44. Karabash: Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Bulgarians—altogether 3,500; factories, road construction.

45, 46. Alma-Ata, Tiypa: No other details.

47, 48, 49. Subcamps. Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, many Ukrainians—altogether 16,000; cutting down forests; airport, factory, railroad, highway construction. [Subcamps

Nos. 47 and 48 located in Lake Baykal area. Subcamp No. 49 located in Amur River area.]

50. Ulan-Ude: Only Russians since 1958—total 3,500; mining of precious metals, forest clearing, railroad track maintenance.

51, 52, 53, 54, 55. Bogoshi, 52 name unknown, Komsomolsk, Gandala, Wagner: Five camps under joint administration; no details concerning nationalities and number but reportedly many Germans, Hungarians, lesser number of Poles; coal mining, coke factory, electric powerplants, railroads, highways, home building, rocket launching site construction. [Subcamp No. 52 located in Amur River area.]

56. Voloshtchovka: Poles, Russians, Germans, and subcamp of 5,000 Bulgarians—altogether 18,000; coal mines, heavy and chemical industries, forest clearance, building of roads and airports.

THE HOFFA STORY—PART 2

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as many residents of New York City know, the New York Daily News and the New York Times are on many occasions poles apart editorially. Their agreement on a particular issue must, to some degree, indicate a fair cross-section of sentiment, at least for those in the New York City area. On March 8, these two giant dailies spoke as one concerning the imprisonment of Jimmy Hoffa the day before at the Federal Penitentiary, Lewisburg, Pa.

Observed the Daily News:

JIMMY TAKES A FALL

He said it couldn't be done, but tough Jimmy Hoffa finally has been hauled off to the pokey—still yelling that jails are for other people. It has been 10 years since the government first began measuring the cocky little Teamsters boss for prison garb; three years since they hooked him for jury tampering. It took the creaking wheels of justice so long to finish the job of putting Jimmy away for eight years that we, along with a lot of others, were beginning to think Hoffa was as jail-proof as he claimed.

Before taking leave, Hoffa brazenly tried to fit himself with a martyr's cloak. "If they can do this to Hoffa, they can do it to anyone," he said.

Change the meaning a little, Jimmy, and that's just the point. Even a man with the power, money and legal talent that a big union overlord has at his command can't break the law and then play hide-and-seek with justice forever.

Devotees of the Times gulped their morning coffee to this temporary editorial sigh of relief:

EXIT HOFFA

The walls of the Federal penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa., swallowed up James R. Hoffa yesterday. The president of the giant International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the country's largest and strongest union, went to jail still insistent that he was the victim of a "conspiracy" by his foes in high Federal office.

But in a real sense Hoffa was the victim of his own twisted code—a code built on the idea that corporate society is a jungle, in which every man has his price. It was that

concept, ingrained in Hoffa by his early battles as a dead-end kid in Detroit and reinforced by all his experiences as he slugged his way to union power, that involved him in a morass of unsavory deals and associations and finally led to his exile from the A.F.L.-C.I.O. as a disgrace to organized labor.

All Hoffa's extraordinary qualities of dynamism, intelligence and courage were flawed and in the end negated by his cynical outlook on the world.

Hoffa hopes to get out of prison in time to resume the five-year presidential term to which he was elected last summer. But the warden at Lewisburg has made it plain that Hoffa will not be allowed to run the union from his cell, even though he once devoted close study to the record of a man who did just that—Joseph S. Fay, whose domination of the New York-New Jersey building trades was only slightly impeded when he was sent to Sing Sing for extortion in 1948.

The country's interest centers now on whether the caretaker regime Hoffa has installed in Teamster power will conclude a strike-free, noninflationary agreement in the negotiations currently under way for a new nationwide trucking contract. After that, a wild scramble is probable inside the union as power blocs form and struggle for ascendancy in an organization accustomed to one-man rule. The union's strategic hold on a key link in America's transportation lifeline makes the outcome of that internecine struggle a matter of consequence for every citizen.

At the present time when it is no longer novel to espouse the doctrine of civil disobedience, the triumph of justice in the Hoffa case is most reassuring. It serves as a source of encouragement to this Nation's young people that even those with awesome power and influence are subject to the laws of the land. Indeed, the awesomeness of our system of laws can be glimpsed from the Hoffa experience in which a formidable source of national power bowed to relentless legal pursuit.

Paul Healy, the author of the three-part series, "The Hoffa Story," recaps for us pertinent events in the Hoffa saga which gained for Lewisburg last Tuesday a most prominent resident. The subtitle of part 2 reads: "He Bet Trouble or Nothing and Raked in the Winnings," and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

THE HOFFA STORY: HE BET TROUBLE OR NOTHING AND RAKED IN THE WINNINGS
(By Paul Healy)

WASHINGTON, March 7.—The rise of Jimmy Hoffa, which was at least temporarily halted when he went behind bars today, was built on a succession of troubles. Troubles with rival union factions, with police, with politicians.

For 35 years, Hoffa turned them to his advantage. As long as he stayed out of jail he could picture himself as being persecuted and boast (inaccurately): "I ain't never been found guilty of nothin' . . ." Hoffa believes he had no choice but to fight for his life with every handy weapon from his earliest beginnings.

He was born Feb. 14, 1913, in Brazil, Ind., the third of four children. His mother was of Irish descent and his father of Dutch origin. His father, a driller in coal mines, died when Jimmy was 7. His mother moved the family to Detroit "looking for some way to keep us alive," Hoffa once recalled.

After seventh grade young Jimmy quit school to become a stock boy in a department store.

When he was strong enough, he got a job at a warehouse unloading produce from box-cars and trucks. Because the foreman "treated us like a dog," Hoffa and five young

colleagues started a union. They forced the company to capitulate by refusing to unload a boxcar of highly perishable strawberries.

In 1932, Hoffa took his union into the Teamsters and soon became business agent and later president of Detroit Local 299. In the roughest days of the depression, Hoffa and his aides went out organizing day and night. They collected dues as far away as Evansville, Ind.

"EVERY STRIKE WAS A FIGHT"

"Every strike was a fight," he has recalled. "Detroit was the open-shop capital of America. Every time you'd go near to a place to organize it, you'd get picked up and put into jail. The police beat you on the head with nightsticks. It was a mess."

Hoffa's brother was shot, and Jimmy himself got his "head broke." He was arrested 18 times in one day. The picket line arrests do not show on the police record. The record shows only that between 1933 and 1947 he was arrested 16 times on a variety of other charges all related to union activities. This total doesn't count traffic violations.

During this period, Hoffa was convicted three times—once of assault and battery in a picket line fight, once of violating the anti-trust law (conspiring with unionized waste paper companies to prevent non-union companies from selling their product) and once on a misdemeanor growing out of a charge that he had forced grocers to buy permits from his union.

DONATED PROCEEDS TO CHILDREN'S HOME

In 1935, Hoffa took the lead in a plan to whip all the Midwest Teamster locals into a single powerful conference—against the wishes of irascible Teamster President Dan Tobin. In 1940, he succeeded. Area conferences also were being organized elsewhere and, in 1952, Hoffa and the other labor "barons" who headed the conferences steamrolled Dave Beck into the presidency in place of Tobin.

Hoffa simultaneously was elected vice president of the Teamsters International, at 29 the youngest man ever to make the executive board. In this post, while the florid, soft-looking Beck made speeches on foreign policy, Hoffa undercut him by handling wages, hours and working conditions.

Whenever a problem arose, Beck sent Hoffa to straighten it out. In each case, Hoffa made new allies—some with criminal records.

Hoffa meanwhile continued to try to improve his public image. By 1956, he was such an important figure in the labor movement that the Teamsters held a \$100-a-plate dinner in his honor in Detroit. Leading Detroit businessmen attended. Hoffa donated the proceeds—\$265,000—to Israel to build a children's home.

Later that year there was set in motion an investigation which would focus for three years on Hoffa, though he was not its initial target.

Chairman John McClellan (D-Ark.) of the Senate Permanent Investigations subcommittee and his chief counsel, Robert Kennedy, were nosing into Teamsters' affairs. They found enough to cause the Senate in early 1957 to set up a select committee on labor and management shenanigans, soon to be known as the rackets committee.

Beck's handling of the union's rich treasury was the committee's immediate concern. But even before they held hearings on Beck, there was a startlingly melodramatic development. Hoffa was brought into court the night of March 13, 1957, on charges of having tried to plant a spy, one John Cheasty, on the committee.

In the Hoffa trial, his first, that summer the government contended that Hoffa had bribed Cheasty, a New York lawyer, to get a job on the committee and feed him information. But Cheasty, the government alleged, had spilled the plot to Kennedy, and Kennedy had asked him to play along with

Hoffa and trap him. Thirty-one FBI agents took the stand to supply details on how the trap had been baited for Hoffa—and how he had allegedly passed \$1,000 to Cheasty.

Kennedy was so confident he said that "if Hoffa isn't convicted, I'll jump off the Capitol."

OFFER TO SUPPLY PARACHUTE FOR R.F.K.

But Hoffa proved to be more convincing on the witness stand than Cheasty. He denied everything and the jury acquitted him. It was one of the greatest of triumphs for defense attorney Edward Bennett Williams—who gloatingly offered to supply a parachute to Bobby for his leap.

But at the same time the McClellan problems were digging deeply into Hoffa's links with the underworld. In August, 1957, they began to spread them on the record. They had already put the skids under Beck, alleging that he had misused \$370,000 in union funds. In September, Hoffa was elected to succeed Beck as Teamsters' president.

Thus in bringing down Beck the committee had unwittingly made room at the top for the much-tougher Hoffa. Newly elected president and fresh from his acquittal, Hoffa was cocky and almost cordial in his first days in the witness chair before the committee. He called Kennedy "Bob" and refused to do what practically all of his accused associates were doing—taking the Fifth Amendment.

Instead, the little president of the world's biggest union, with attorney Williams sitting next to him at \$1,000 a day, relied on what he claimed was an incredibly bad memory. He knew that nobody could go to jail for perjury if he could get away with saying: "I don't recall."

An ordinary witness might have been embarrassed by some of the corners this led Hoffa into.

When Kennedy asked Hoffa if he knew New York hoodlum John Dioguardi (alias Johnny Dio), he blandly replied: "Not to my recollection."

Then, as Kennedy prepared to play a tape of a tapped telephone call between Dio and Hoffa, he quickly emphasized: "Let the record show that I said it was to the best of my recollection."

As the weeks and weeks of hearings wore on, Hoffa seemed to wilt under the TV lights as more wiretaps and other evidence was produced to show that gangster types and terror and violence ruled much of his union. Once, he got so rattled he ended up spouting: "To the best of my recollection I must recall on my memory that I cannot remember. . . ."

"Is that your answer?" Kennedy asked incredulously. The audience laughed.

"Well, I am trying to help," Hoffa replied. "This is a serious situation."

"If these things do not refresh your memory," drawled McClellan wearily, "it would take the power of God to do it. The instrumentalities of mankind obviously are not adequate . . . proceed."

During the 1958 hearings, Kennedy later recalled, Hoffa sometimes fixed him with an evil eye—"A deep, strange penetrating expression of intense hatred." Then, Kennedy said, "he would wink at me. I can't explain it. Maybe a psychiatrist would recognize the symptoms."

In its report, the rackets committee charged that the Teamsters membership had been betrayed, democratic processes had been stifled, that money, including pension, and welfare funds, had been misused to the tune of at least \$9.5 million. It warned that cogs in the union which controlled all transportation in the U.S. were in the hands of the likes of Dio.

HE GAVE KENNEDY'S CHANCE TO SHINE

For these "corrupt practices" the Teamsters were kicked out of the AFL-CIO by a vote of

5-1. Hoffa thumbed his nose at the federation. His main effort was to survive as the Teamsters' monarch.

Not all the challenges to Hoffa's absolute power as president could be squelched by his musclemen. In 1958, a group of hardy dissident Teamsters filed suit in federal district court to prevent his taking office. The court allowed Hoffa to remain as provisional president pending a cleanup of the union to be carried out under the prodding of a board of three outside monitors."

The board was a gun held at the head of Hoffa. It was dissolved after installing a modern accounting system for the union's labyrinth of finances.

If the racket committee had inadvertently put Hoffa in the Teamsters' saddle, Hoffa, a perfect foil, had given two ambitious young men a chance to play the "good guys."

Sen. John F. Kennedy (D-Mass.), a member of the committee, was planning to run for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1960, and his brother Robert was to manage his campaign. The investigation of Hoffa had made the Kennedy "brother act" familiar through newspapers and television to the households of the nation.

Republican Hoffa fought the Kennedy candidacy. He did not relish the Kennedys pursuing their "vendetta" against him from the White House. When Kennedy was elected and Bobby became Attorney General, he discovered that his court troubles—which he had always licked before—were just beginning.

FEWER PEOPLE ARE BEING FOOLED BY L.B.J. PROPOSALS

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, my mail reflects exactly what my close contact with the voters has shown: fewer people are being fooled by White House doubletalk. Whether the subject be Vietnam or taxes, social security or the farm program, there is a growing awareness of the credibility gap between promise and performance.

A few years ago, workers were going to receive "help" by having their profit sharing plans changed from capital gains treatment to ordinary income treatment. The farmer has come to realize that voluntary farm programs are really controlled programs. Tax "revisions" usually end up being tax increases. People know this—they are not fooled.

A constituent of mine from Mt. Vernon, Ohio, has not been fooled. The following letter indicates that he, like many more of his fellow Americans, have pierced the veil of semantics here in Washington and knows what is going on. This is one American speaking and I suggest that all Members of this body consider these views, Mr. Speaker. Fewer people are being taken in by the liberal big spenders. Their day is coming. I am also including the article from the Thursday, March 2, 1967, Wall Street Journal to which my constituent has referred.

The letter and article follow:

MARCH 6, 1967.

Representative JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: I hesitate writing you again, so soon after our recent exchange of correspondence; however, the enclosed article in the Wall Street Journal of March 2nd is of such significance that I feel I must again express to you my thinking, and my resultant personal situation.

I am 72 years of age, and am filled with apprehension each time I read something to the effect that the Treasury Department is concerned over the "welfare" of the 20 million persons over 65, and intend to make some revisions in their special allowances. Each time, in my case, the revisions ultimately resulted in an increase in my Income Tax. This in turn has created a greater "freeze" in my personal investments, as well as a reduction in my general spending.

For example, several years ago the Press, TV and Radio heralded an average 20% reduction in personal Income Taxes through a readjustment in the rate structure. Coincident with this, the 4% credit allowed for years for Dividends Received was first reduced by 2%, and then eliminated altogether the following year.

The 4% taken away from the Stockholders was passed back to the Corporations issuing the Dividends, by reducing their basic tax from 52% to 48%. This has meant a substantial tax increase to me personally, and other Golden Agers in my predicament, as 71% of my total income this past year, including Social Security and Pension, has come from Dividends. The result is that instead of being decreased, my tax has actually been increased.

The Treasury Department has announced that in 1967 the full deduction from income for Prescriptions and Medical costs will no longer be allowed for those over 65, but the usual 1% and 3% of Total Income must first be deducted.

Announcement has also been made that full Hospital and Medical Insurance Policy Premiums deductions will no longer be granted those over 65, but only one-half, or not over a maximum of \$150.00. Again both of these revisions affect me, and serve to raise my total tax considerably.

I now read in the enclosed article that President Johnson is proposing further changes in the tax structure for those over 65. Under this proposal the additional \$600 Personal Exemption is to be eliminated, as well as tax credit for retirement income. These are to be replaced by a single exemption, as the current system is "too complicated".

Together these latest revisions again represent a still further increase in Taxation for me, and undoubtedly for the majority of the 1.4 million mentioned who will be affected, out of a total of 20 million citizens who are over 65, or approximately only 7% of this age group. I do not know what the percentile is out of the overall total of all taxpayers; however, it must be miniscule.

The absence of a powerful Lobby, or insufficient Voter Strength, seems to be the only discernible reasons as to why this class of Citizen has been singled out each year for the past several for those substantial increases, whereas the major sources of the needed and justifiable additional tax income seem to continue to maintain Lobbies strong enough to protect them from paying their reasonable and rightful share. I refer to the so-called "Co-operatives" and the "quasi legal" Foundations, who in many instances are in direct competition with tax paying Corporations, yet are still tax exempt. Also included are Insurance Companies, Oil Depletion Allowances, and many other recognized tax loopholes and inequities.

No one objects to paying their fair share of the cost of maintaining the justifiable

costs of our Government, but when a small minority is repeatedly subjected to a withdrawal of their so-called "Golden Age Considerations", and forced to bear a disproportionate share of taxation, we can only lay our situation before fair minded Legislators such as you, and ask for help.

Writing you on this subject is redundant, as I am sure I know your personal feelings; however, I do want to add a few significant and personal facts, as one of your Constituents, to your arsenal of Ammunition on this subject when this subject comes up on the Floor of the House for consideration.

Again, with best personal regards, believe me.

Cordially yours,

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 2, 1967]
NEW TAX TREATMENT OF RETIREMENT INCOME INCLUDED IN PROPOSED SOCIAL SECURITY BOOST

WASHINGTON.—One-third of the nation's elderly taxpayers would pay higher levies under President Johnson's proposed changes in the tax treatment of Social Security pensions and other retirement income, a Treasury official said.

As part of his requested package of higher Social Security cash benefits, Mr. Johnson is asking for abolition of the long-standing income-tax exemption for Social Security pension checks, an end to the extra \$600 personal exemption enjoyed by over-65 taxpayers, and repeal of a special tax credit for such retirement income as dividends, interest and rents. The Administration wants these special exemptions replaced with a single exemption.

The tax proposals were disclosed by Assistant Treasury Secretary Stanley Surrey as the House Ways and Means Committee opened public hearings on the Social Security package. Mr. Surrey argued that the current system is too complicated and discriminates against persons who keep working after age 65. Committee members are expected to question Administration officials closely on the proposal when testimony resumes this morning.

Mr. Surrey said that of the 20 million citizens age 65 or over, only 4.2 million currently have some income-tax liability.

The Administration wants these special exemptions replaced with a single exemption. Mr. Surrey argued that the current system is too complicated and discriminates against persons who keep working after age 65.

Under the proposed system, single persons over 65 would get a \$2,300 exemption, but if they earned more than \$5,600 annually they would lose \$1 of the exemption for each dollar of income over \$5,600, with the exemption vanishing at \$7,900. Married couples would be granted a \$4,000 exemption, but if they earn more than \$11,200 annually the exemption would be cut back dollar for dollar for income over \$11,200, with the exemption eliminated at \$15,200.

According to Treasury calculations, the new system would remove about 500,000 low-income elderly taxpayers from the list of 4.2 million over-65 persons who currently pay taxes. Mr. Surrey said that 2.3 million more would pay lower taxes, but that 1.4 million of the upper income elderly—a third of this tax-paying group—would pay more.

"They will lose the special tax benefits now available to them since they have no demonstrable need for special tax relief," Mr. Surrey said. He added, though, that the higher tax bills would in many cases be offset by the President's companion proposal for a 15% increase in Social Security pensions.

RESULTS OF POLL

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]

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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the tabulations have just been completed on my first constituent poll of this session, and I find the results most interesting.

I was particularly interested in the opinions expressed on the President's policy in Vietnam and the bombing raids on North Vietnam.

It would appear from the overwhelming support for these raids that the majority of the people favor heavy pressure to end this conflict, and feel that unilateral cessation of the raids would merely prolong the war.

However, the administration position on Vietnam generally barely received approval of the majority of those answering the poll. This would indicate that the people are divided on the question of the President's leadership, for whatever reason, but are willing to give him the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the RECORD the results of this poll:

1. In general, do you agree with President Johnson's policy on Viet Nam?

	Percent
Yes	58
No	36

2. Continue the bombing of North Viet Nam or stop it?

	Percent
Continue	75
Stop	21

3. Permit tax credits for some portion of college tuition payments?

	Percent
Yes	77
No	22

4. Permit tax credits to private industry for some portion of the cost of job training?

	Percent
Yes	43
No	52

5. Tighten postal regulations to reduce the amount of unsolicited mail delivered to homes?

	Percent
Yes	88
No	9

6. The President should be elected by popular vote instead of through the Electoral College?

	Percent
Yes	82
No	14

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker recently said in Buenos Aires:

In no part of the world does the United States have greater and deeper ties than it has in the Western hemisphere.

This profound but simple statement of fact lends added substance to the validity of our participation in the forthcoming summit meeting of the American Presidents at Punta del Este.

President Johnson will bring to this historic event deep and sincere manifestations of friendship for our Latin American neighbors in clear support of Ambassador Bunker's words.

Encouraging developments have been achieved in the years of the Alliance for Progress, but much more achievement is necessary. In this great undertaking, we must count on the best contributions both of government and of the private sector, throughout the hemisphere.

It is my earnest hope that greater incentives can be generated to stimulate private enterprise in the economy of these developing nations. Obviously, the role of governments is essential, but many believe that the ultimate success or failure of the Alliance for Progress will be determined essentially by the attitudes and actions of the business community in both the United States and Latin American countries. For we all know that private enterprise, given encouragement, can provide much of the stuff of progress—industry, diversification, jobs, and better living conditions.

To encourage U.S. investors, the United States has concluded investment guaranty agreements with 18 Latin American republics.

Under the specific risk guaranty program, U.S. private investors are protected by the Agency for International Development against the inconvertibility of local currencies and possible losses resulting from expropriation, war, revolution, and insurrection.

The United States and our Latin American partners in the Alliance for Progress have no bias against private enterprise. One of the goals of the Punta del Este Declaration is to stimulate private enterprise in order to encourage the development of Latin American countries at a rate which will help them to provide jobs for their growing population, to eliminate unemployment and to take their place among the modern industrialized nations of the world.

Thus the programs of the Alliance for Progress look to a constantly strengthened and modernized private sector as a major instrument for economic expansion.

I wish the President Godspeed and I have every confidence that our representation at Punta del Este will gain full support at home.

INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT BILL WOULD AID NORTH COUNTRY ECONOMY

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would allow State or community-owned airports to qualify as international airports of entry and thus have customs facilities, if they were willing to pay for the services.

Because of the importance of this bill to the economy of northern New Hampshire, I urge that it be given quick consideration by the House of Representatives. The reasons for introduction of the measure are contained in the press release I issued today, which I attach here for my colleagues' perusal:

INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT BILL IS INTRODUCED

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressman James C. Cleveland today introduced a bill he said could be "a boon to air travel and the economy in our Northern areas."

The bill would require designation of state or community-owned airports as international airports of entry if the state or local governmental agency agrees to provide facilities and funds for customs' operations at the airports.

Several airports in Northern New Hampshire could benefit from this legislation, said Congressman Cleveland, including those at Berlin and Whitefield. Expo '67 adds special urgency to the need for this legislation, he said.

In the past, explained Congressman Cleveland, Treasury Department officials have not established customs' facilities at smaller airports because of the costs involved. And, he said, even in cases where the communities or states owning the airports were willing to pay the full costs involved, Treasury officials were prevented by law from installing customs' service.

Cleveland's bill would change this and allow establishment of the customs' facilities, if the airport owner agreed to furnish free airport space for the federal officials and reimburse the federal government for salaries and operational expenses.

Such designations as international airports in Northern New Hampshire would allow travelers from Canada to land in these airports instead of having to detour to larger airports further South as is now the case.

FAIR PAY FOR HOUSE WITNESSES IS PROPOSED

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced legislation to pay witnesses before committees of the House of Representatives the same appearance fees and expenses paid by the other body and by Federal agencies.

Witnesses now testifying before House committees are paid \$9 a day and 7 cents a mile for travel. But at the same time, witnesses who testify before committees of the Senate and Federal agencies are paid \$16 a day and are reimbursed for travel at the rate of 12 cents a mile.

This discrepancy is wrong and is unfair to these witnesses. Often persons appearing as witnesses before my own House Committee on Public Works are persons who receive low salaries and who have had to travel long distances to Washington. The higher rates of compensation allowed by the Senate and Federal agencies are themselves only barely adequate, if that, to pay necessary expenses. The compensation paid by the House is wholly inadequate.

Our present limitations were established in 1955. Perhaps they were realistic then, but it is impossible to imagine trying to visit Washington at today's prices, high hotel rates, meal costs and other expenses, on \$9 a day.

The failure to pay adequate compensation to witnesses is not only a severe burden on the individuals involved, it actually impedes the work of committees. Often, persons whose testimony is sorely needed are unable to appear because they cannot afford the financial drain. I urge my colleagues to approve the more realistic figure of compensation.

CHIPPEWA INDIANS CLAIMS BILL

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am, today, introducing a bill to pay off a 112-year-old debt owed by the Federal Government to the Mississippi, Pillager, and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands of Chippewa Indians.

Under this bill, members of these bands would receive the moneys awarded them in a 1965 judgment by the Indian Claims Commission, and the governing bodies of the White Earth, Leech Lake, and Mille Lacs Reservations would determine how such moneys will be spent.

My bill represents a recent consensus of the Chippewa Bands involved, but no moneys can be distributed until such legislation is passed by Congress and signed into law by the President.

As a sponsor of similar legislation in the previous Congress, I am hopeful that the current Congress will take favorable action on my new bill at the earliest feasible time.

The bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians on behalf of the Mississippi Bands and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands of Chippewa Indians

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians on behalf of the Mississippi Bands and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands of Chippewa Indians that were appropriated by the Act of October 31, 1965, to pay a judgment by the Indian

Claims Commission in docket 18-B, and the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing bodies of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe and the White Earth, Leech Lake, and Mille Lacs Reservations with whom the members of the Mississippi Bands and Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands of Chippewa Indians are affiliated, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita to the members of the tribe shall not be (1) subject to the Federal or State income tax, (2) subject to any lien or claim of attorneys or creditors, and (3) held to be "other income and resources" as that term is used in sections 2(a)(10)(A), 402(a)(7), 1002(a)(8), and 1602(a)(14) of the Social Security Act, as amended.

SUPPORT OF RESTORATION OF 7-PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McDONALD] 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the President has asked the Congress to restore the 7-percent investment credit for business. Certainly, the sluggish economy that we are now experiencing can be traced, in part, to the decision to clamp the lid on the investment credit. And as a representative of a district acutely sensitive to slumping auto sales, swollen inventories, and projected layoffs, I favor any measure which will spur the economy. But, there are certain inconsistencies in the President's call for a singular measure to cure our current economic ills which must also be eradicated if our economy is to regain its health.

First, it is incredible to believe that the businessman will hasten to take advantage of this tax credit when the administration continues to demand that a 6-percent surcharge be imposed on corporate profits. And it is inconsistent with sound economic practices to decrease revenues without cutting back on expenditures as well. Neither the consumer nor the corporation will be pleased to be mortgaged with a huge deficit.

The President informed the Congress in January that his budget forecast a deficit of some \$8 billion even with the surcharge. Now, we are told that the deficit will climb to some \$12 billion. If this is the case, then we simply must curtail our domestic spending.

But, that aside, I question whether restoration of the investment tax credit is not too little too late. Five months ago, the administration informed us that the 7-percent investment credit had to be removed in order to halt what appeared to be an inflationary trend. This despite certain indications which suggested that the rapid growth in new plant and equipment expenditures was slowing of its own accord.

Yet, the President had his way and everything came to a screeching halt, so much so that the Department of Commerce now tells us that we face a serious decline in capital investment. Rather than the projected rise of \$1.5 billion, capital expenditures have dropped from \$62.8 billion in the fourth quarter of last year to \$62.6 billion in the first quarter of 1967; and, it is anticipated that they will sink to \$62.25 billion in the second quarter.

Now the administration is moving to reverse a serious miscalculation. But, is this single measure sufficient? I think not.

Faced with the prospect of a 6-percent surcharge, the businessman is not likely to embark on some ventures to increase profits. Faced with the prospect of increased taxes to pay off a huge Federal deficit, the consumer is not likely to increase his spending. Hence, we need not only to remove the threat of added taxes and cut down on the appropriations for domestic programs, we must also consider other measures for strengthening our economy.

We should, for example, immediately consider an across-the-board corporate income tax cut so that companies not in a position to invest in new facilities or equipment will be encouraged to make other expenditures. And we should consider the possibility of cutting excise taxes as a way of strengthening consumer spending.

In any event, we cannot expect any significant gains from the restoration of the investment credit if we do not, at the same time, abandon the proposal for a surcharge, curb our domestic spending, and provide some incentives for the economy to develop free of constant and quixotic manipulation by the Federal Government.

THE FARMERS' FLIGHT

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a good friend of mine who is a farmer in the vicinity of New Ulm, Minn., Mr. Armund Scheibel, in which he asks, "What is going to happen to the American farmers?" He goes on to state that taxes on his farm have gone up \$929 since 1952 and that he has been forced to compete with meat and dairy imports in the face of the cost price squeeze which is reducing farm income and has driven the parity price ratio down to 74 percent.

In order to bring Mr. Scheibel's letter to the attention of my colleagues I place his letter in my remarks together with a newspaper article which Mr. Scheibel enclosed with his letter reporting an interview with Mr. Homer Jackson, manager of the Production Credit Association of Rifle, Colo.:

NEW ULM, MINN.,
March 8, 1967.

ANCHER NELSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: What is going to happen to the American farmers?

With taxes going up for example my farm since 1952 my taxes have gone up \$929.00. Dairy herds are being sold off right and left. We have been a well fed nation for many, many years and now our products are priced below production cost. Meat and dairy products are being imported. ANCHER where are we going. Are we going to be swallowed up by corporation farming and our children and grandchildren become slave labor. ANCHER you and JOHN ZWACH should lay down the law to the big city congressman you both know how hard it is to come by a dollar by farming. For your information I am sending you a clipping of a P.C.A. manager out in the ranch country to me it is just terrible.

Please turn this clipping over to the other senators from Minnesota such as MCCARTHY and MONDALE and ZWACH.

Trusting this will give you a little thought as to what rural people are concerned about.

Yours truly,

ARMUND SCHEIBEL.

THE PLANNED DESTRUCTION OF THE FAMILY FARM—A LONGTIME CATTLEMAN'S DEVASTATINGLY FORTHRIGHT ATTACK ON CHAIN MONOPOLIES AND THEIR DESTRUCTIVE AIMS

Homer Jackson is manager of the Production Credit Association of Rifle, Colorado, a position he has held for 23 years. An outspoken advocate of the family-owned farm and ranch, he has appeared often before commissions and public officials on behalf of stockmen. Early in 1965 he contacted members of the National Food Marketing Commission in Washington and officials of the Packers and Stockyards Division of the United States Department of Agriculture in order to detail for them the plight of the primary producer in the red meat business. Later, he appeared before the National Food Marketing Commission at the Cheyenne, Wyoming hearings. The opinions and findings expressed here are those of Mr. Jackson; provocative and devastatingly forthright, they are cause for serious reflections and discussion.

NFO Reporter: Mr. Jackson, in your talks before cattlemen's associations, wool growers—in short, those in the farming business—what do you try to convey.

Jackson: I tell them that if they are stockmen or bankers or in business in any way connected with livestock production, they have one thing in common—we are losing our position in the livestock industry. It is essential for responsible people in position of leadership throughout the livestock industry, within Congress and governmental departments, as well as the publishers of all sources of news media to recognize that fundamentally the producers of livestock represent the foundation of the entire industry.

NFO Reporter: What is the greatest threat at this time.

Jackson: The greatest threat to the livestock industry and the future welfare of the farm families of America is that whether through blindness, ignorance or complacency of fear of retaliation, leadership overlooks or fails to evaluate the crumbling deterioration of the industry at the foundation level.

NFO Reporter: By crumbling deterioration, do you mean the stockmen are going broke?

Jackson: Exactly. To present a picture of the situation, I would like to start by outlining our experience in financing the stockmen of northwestern Colorado. At least 91 per cent of our loans are in financing livestock. Last year we loaned over \$18 million and this year we were about \$3 million ahead

of that. Over the past nearly a quarter of a century we have studied the operating methods, operating costs, repayment programs, financial statements, marketing methods and market prices. I am sure that anyone of you who could have been in our position for this length of time would appreciate the seriousness of this momentous trend that has taken hold of agriculture and the speed and certainty with which these giant corporate chain stores, packing houses and feedlots are controlling and taking over our industry.

NFO Reporter: Specifically, how does cost-of-production square with the prices ranchers are getting for, say, calves?

Jackson: The year 1965 was the 7th straight year when the average price of calves sold off our ranches was below cost of production. Over 90 per cent of the ranch operators today cannot show a sound reasonable program of total debt repayment from the livestock operation. Income from livestock will not meet operating costs, provide a living and permit repayment of the livestock and real estate loans in more than 90 per cent of the cases.

NFO Reporter: With 90 per cent of the farmers simply not making it, what kind of a picture is this constructing?

Jackson: People are leaving the farms and ranches at the most rapid rate in the history of this nation—500,000 farm and ranch people were economically forced out of business in 1965. Colorado alone lost 5,000 farms in the past five years. Those who stayed have doubled their loans to do so. To give you some facts: during 1960, our association loaned \$10 million to 410 members. During 1965, we loaned \$18 million to 375 members. In 1960 our average sized loan was \$14,900. In 1965, it was \$32,000.

NFO Reporter: Considering this loan picture, and the prices being received for livestock, does the present situation make mandatory loan cutoffs?

Jackson: The only way we and other leaders can continue financing livestock operations is by using real estate as additional collateral. To point out how this practice has grown—seven years ago, in 1958, we had 6 per cent of our loans secured by real estate collateral valued at less than \$1 million. Today, 56 per cent of the loans are secured by real estate collateral valued just under \$12 million. Now these figures are facts and they clearly show the extent to which stockmen are pledging their ranch holdings to absorb operating losses.

NFO Reporter: To digress a moment—what does this situation do to young people entering the ranching or farming business?

Jackson: It is economically impossible for young people to engage in the ownership of practical sized farms or ranches. In fact, if we do not get a profit back into the ranching business or the American family owned ranches and farms, they are through. That's why it is time for responsible people to recognize what's going on. I am sure that not one rancher in 20 understands or is even thinking about the real causes affecting his markets and we all have an enormous job of informing the producers. It is time we jerked the blindfolds off.

NFO reporter: At bottom, why is the producer in the position you've just described?

Jackson: To understand this, we've got to analyze our marketing methods. The only system of marketing we have ever known has been governed by the law of supply and demand creating a competitive marketing system. That system is still working at the ranch level out here in the country, but it has been replaced completely by monopolistic control in the other end of our industry.

NFO reporter: Do you mean the stocker cattle situation?

Jackson: Yes. As an example, at the beginning of this year, we had a very active demand for stocker cattle here in the coun-

try. Farmers and ranchers began bidding against each other for calves and breeding cows which forced the market up. This created optimism and as the market advanced, optimism grew stronger and what we have had here in the country these past few months is the only market we have ever known—supply and demand and competitive bidding actively controlling the market and establishing the prices. But we should keep in mind, it was the result of ranchers and farmers bidding against each other to force their own market up and they borrowed the money to do so. But when we get away from the country market and livestock moves to the feed lots, to the packers and the retailers, then the law of supply and demand and competitive bidding no longer establishes market prices, and the chain stores primarily are in control.

NFO Reporter: Let's talk about chain stores a minute. What is their position and method of control?

Jackson: In the U.S., approximately 90 per cent of all the dressed beef and groceries are sold through chain stores. Now the whole basic concept of our problem rests on a clear understanding of that point. Just keep in mind that before they can sell it, they first have to buy it. When they are that big in the retail market, they are of like sizes in the buying market and they have a dominant, complete control over the market.

NFO Reporter: Can you clarify what you mean by the term "control?"

Jackson: Compare conditions today in the major terminal markets with what they were like a few years ago. Most of us have shipped to and are familiar with the Denver market. Remember when the market opened on Monday morning, the alleys would be full of local merchants, meat market owners and butchers from all over the city of Denver and neighboring areas. Also, the packer buyers were out in force to supply the outlying towns and areas away from Denver. All of those buyers were on that market, bidding against each other to fill their orders for the coming week. That was competition. It was there every week throughout the entire year and the law of supply and demand was in control.

NFO Reporter: What's the market like today?

Jackson: Well, those merchants, meat market owners and butchers of our state, in fact, of all the United States, have been replaced by chain stores and the major chains set the market by simply stating the price they will pay for dressed meat. They don't bother to go into the yards and bid on the live animals. They simply set the prices their stores will pay for dressed meat and that dressed meat price establishes a "ceiling" under which the packer, the feedlot and the producer have to operate. This is the situation in Denver and it is duplicated in all the major markets throughout the nation. The retail chain stores with their enormous concentration of buying power control the "ceiling" price of dressed meat and the rest of the industry has to live under that "ceiling."

NFO Reporter: Yet you hear talk of chains competing with each other, and the National Food Marketing Commission more or less gave a clean bill of health to chains.

Jackson: Still the hearings established that chains are not in competition with each other to the extent that their volume makes it appear for several reasons: First, the big major chains are fairly well operating in separate areas of the country. Second, there are 25 major chains in the country that do 80 to 85 per cent of the retail business. It has been established that 23 of these stores do not have their own procurement or purchasing agencies. Rather, they buy off what is known as the "yellow sheet." The "yellow sheet" is a marketing publication listing prices of dressed beef, pork, lamb, dairy prod-

ucts, etc. Now 23 of the major stores use that price guide to determine what they will pay rather than to set up their own procurement agency and go out and bid on a competitive market. Their reason, as some have stated, is that if they know they are paying the same price for their products that their competitor pays, they can meet competition with their competitor in the retail market.

NFO Reporter: Are there any chains that do not follow the "yellow sheet"?

Jackson: The two largest chains in the nation reportedly do not follow the "yellow sheet" but do have their own procurement agency and buy on the active markets.

NFO Reporter: Who puts out the "yellow sheet"—that is, who determines the "yellow sheet" prices?

Jackson: That question has not been answered in any meaningful way, and it has not been confirmed just who the publishers are, but it is generally accepted that since "the two majors" set their own market prices that the "yellow sheet" is based on the average price paid by the two major chains.

NFO Reporter: Doesn't this imply that two chains are setting the price for most of the food commodities of this nation?

Jackson: It does. In other words, about a half dozen men fix the price of dressed beef for the nation each week—a price that the entire cattle industry has to live under. Now think that through. There's nothing competitive about such an arrangement and we stockmen accept it by saying, "There's nothing we can do about it."

NFO Reporter: What effect does this concentrated buying power of the giant chains have over packers and feedlot operators?

Jackson: To understand that, we have to look into the manipulations and price fixing practices the packers have resorted to in order to live under the "ceiling" price established by the chains. Now the packer may know as far as a week in advance what the price for dressed beef is going to be, so he contacts the country feedlots and buys their cattle at a fixed price. They are shipped to his plant and bypass the terminal market entirely. He tells the feeder he will pay the same price on the market so why should the feeder pay a commission. This practice has become so prominent that it has forced the terminal markets out of business and destroyed competitive bidding.

NFO Reporter: What about packers going into the feedlot business?

Jackson: Well, they have done that. Now that in itself would not appear harmful to us and we might take the position that packer-owned feedlots offer another outlet for feeder cattle—which as producers suits us because we are always looking for more customers. But the packer-owned feedlot is one of the most vicious market controlling powers operating today.

NFO Reporter: What is the anatomy of this "controlling power"?

Jackson: A packer with his own cattle on feed is in a position to draw on his own supply anytime he needs them and can easily depress a market by doing so. Mr. Rodeen, President of the Sioux City, Iowa Stockyards, brought out in his testimony at the Des Moines Food Commission hearings how effectively packers there controlled his market. He illustrated by explaining that due to storm conditions they were about 2,000 cattle short on the market. Now normally a shortage of 2,000 cattle would raise the market \$1.00 to \$1.50. He said that two packers sent to their own feedlots that day and shipped in 2,500 cattle which were dumped on the terminal market. So, instead of having a shortage of 2,000 head, their market was oversupplied by 500 head and it broke the price 50 cents. Take April 22, 1966. The Denver market quoted slaughter steers 50 cents to 70 cents lower and heifers fully 50 cents lower. Sales were confirmed on 310 loads of steers and 248 loads of heifers for a total of 558 loads. The market stated that

packers were filling larger than normal share of their requirements from their own feedlots. Now that is an example where ample cattle are available on the market to supply the packers demand, but instead of buying on the terminal markets, the packer can go to his own feedlot to supply his demand and thus break the market 50 cents to 75 cents by doing so. And if you want to figure that out, it amounts to somewhere around 70 to 80 thousand bucks on one day's trade.

NFO Reporter: What about contract feeding?

Jackson: This is another tactic they are using to get around the Packers and Stockyard Act, which limits their own feeding operation. They contract with individuals, farmers and others to feed for them and in this manner they have a supply of cattle on feed which they are able to draw on at will, the same as if they were in their own feedlots. This packer feeding combination is the direct control of market prices for fat cattle that we are confronted with today. It is this combination of power and manipulation that the Bandstra Bill is designed to break up and certainly it deserves the support of the stockmen of this state.

NFO Reporter: What was the Bandstra bill?

Jackson: The Bandstra bill was a bill which Representative Bandstra of Iowa sponsored for the purpose of prohibiting them from contract feeding and contract buying. This measure received strong support from the feeders and stockmen in Iowa, Nebraska and Wyoming, and I recommended that stockmen in Colorado support it.

NFO Reporter: Doesn't the Packers and Stockyards Act supposedly prohibit chain stores from getting into the feedlot business and likewise limit the extent to which packers may feed?

Jackson: The Packers and Stockyards Act under the USDA was passed in 1921 and contains many effective controls and protective laws, but it needs to be brought up to date and some laws revised to meet present day conditions. The Packers and Stockyards Act does not require the packer to report cattle he has on contract feeding, nor does it require him to report cattle on hand less than 30 days. He does not have to report cattle owned by individual members of his firm. As an example, the Mumford Feed Lot is also the Mumford Packing Company. It is all the same family. In reporting to Packers and Stockyards Division, Mumford Packing reported feeding approximately 25,000 cattle. Actually the Mumford Feed Lots feed about 175 to 200 thousand cattle. In short, these reports by the Packers and Stockyards Division are not only erroneous but they are protecting the packer and are injurious to our position.

NFO Reporter: To what extent are packers feeding?

Jackson: The national figure for the per cent of packer feeding varies from 4.5 per cent to 5.5 per cent. They show, for instance, in Colorado that packers are engaged to the tune of 5.5 per cent. Actually it is known that they feed approximately 30 percent and one feedlot operator testified that it would run about 40 per cent. California runs about 35 per cent. Arizona approximately 50 per cent and other states hold the general comparison.

NFO Reporter: Are economic projections based on the low USDA figures, or on the "actual figures"?

Jackson: The USDA reports obtained through the Packers and Stockyards Division are used by economists, colleges, editorialists and most everyone who publishes information regarding the markets or who studies them. This erroneous information going to our Congressmen, governmental department heads and being published through all of our marketing news is a major damaging factor to our end of the industry.

NFO Reporter: What about the corporate feedlots? How do they fit into the picture?

Jackson: Well, they're springing up all over the country and crowding out the individual farmer feeder. The Agricultural College at Fort Collins recently reported that 7 per cent of the feedlots in Colorado fed 85 per cent of the cattle and that figure is generally about true over most of the western states. Nearly 65 per cent of the individual farmer-owned feedlots have been crowded out of business. The effect of these big feedlots in combination with the packer owned feedlots has been to erect another control over our marketing methods.

NFO Reporter: At the feeder level?

Jackson: To clarify this, let's go back and compare the Denver market a few years ago over in the Feeder Division with conditions as they are today. Remember when you shipped in the fall, the alleys were full of farmers and individual feeders in there bidding against each other to buy feeder cattle for their own feedlots. That made competition. Nearer home, remember when we started the Rio Blanco and Holy Cross Feeder Sales through the Rifle and Glenwood Springs auctions? We had individual farmers and feeders from the Fort Collins-Greeley area of this state and from Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska all coming to these sales to buy their feeder cattle and the barns were full of active competitive buyers. Now with conditions as they are, 65 per cent of the feeders forced out of business, the big packer feedlots and the big corporate feedlots are represented on the central markets and in the auction barns by one or two order buyers. These fellows have a fixed price in their pocket and they immediately establish a "ceiling price for the auction that day." Also, they are going to the country with that same price in their pocket telling the producer that he can save money by selling at home instead of paying a commission through the auction.

NFO Reporter: In a word, the competitive market system has vanished?

Jackson: That's right. All of the major terminal markets have been nearly eliminated. The Denver Stockyards is closing down to an auction market only, just one commission firm. Kansas City is in about the same position. Chicago, except for a hog market, is nearly closed. Los Angeles has completely gone out of the picture. Omaha remains today as the leading terminal market, but like the rest its days are numbered. The competitive market system is gone and for anyone to still contend otherwise is simply being blind to realities and is most harmful to us.

NFO Reporter: In spite of the known existing controls over markets, many economists and leading spokesmen for the cattle industry are still using the prospects for "demand" as offering a bright future for the farmer. In fact, the same has been expressed by high USDA officials in regard to other farm production.

Jackson: No denying that demand is greater than we have ever known in our lifetime. We have had the greatest demand we could hope for ever since World War II. Our population has increased nearly 50 million. Per capita consumption has doubled from 50 to 100 pounds per person. And still we are selling our cattle today at about 30 per cent less than we sold them for 15 years ago. Demand has nothing to do with it. The population is estimated to reach 330 million in the next 34 years. The world population will double from 3 billion today to 6 and one-fourth billion in the next 35 years. There is no other product this nation produces in greater demand than beef, and still, we, at the foundation level are being forced out of business. I just noticed a published report recently to the effect that our government and other leading world governments are seriously concerned

with the fact that right now we are producing food on a hand-to-mouth basis. Here in America our surpluses are gone. So don't worry about demand. It is here and will be here for generations to come. We will not benefit from it under our present marketing methods.

NFO Reporter: In your opinion, what will cattlemen have to do to protect the markets of their industry?

Jackson: We have to obtain from Congress a law forcing monopolistic controls over the chain stores and the packers. Their buying practices and their retail business should be regulated through some form of P.U.C. authority, the same as we control all public utilities. They must be required to pay the cost of production. If we are to survive, we must establish our own marketing system under which we set the price for the produce we sell instead of asking the buyer to set the price for us. We are still selling just as we did 100 years ago. We haven't changed or improved our method of marketing at all. Colorado cattlemen are celebrating their 100th anniversary this year. If they hope to celebrate their 105th anniversary, then we in this state and the stockmen of the nation must wake up and go after some effective methods for protecting the markets of their industry.

NFO Reporter: How much time do farmers and ranchers have?

Jackson: Let's back off from the trees and look at the forest. Make your own observation of what you know and see going on before you. Draw your own conclusions. At least 95 per cent of the local merchants and butchers are gone; 65 per cent of the farmer feedlots are out of business; 500,000 farmers forced out of business last year. Colorado lost 5,000 in the past five years, and livestock and real estate indebtedness has doubled. All of our major central markets have gone out in the past five years. Draw your own conclusions. This is no longer a trend. This is no longer something to talk about that may happen in the future. We are on our way out. We haven't much time left. It has happened to others and it is happening to us.

PROPOSAL FOR INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McClure] 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal for increased Social Security taxes has not caught the fancy of my constituents. I have had a great deal of mail on the subject, and nearly all of it opposes the administration's program. A surprising amount of the protests have been made by social security recipients themselves who see it as: First, inflationary; second, a hardship on young wage-earners who must foot the bill; and third, the latest in a series of vote-buying gimmicks heralding the 1968 election—vote now, pay later.

In this connection, I wish to pay tribute to Berwyn Burke, of the Halley, Idaho Times, for a very perceptive editorial on this subject. I include it as a part of my remarks.

[From the Halley Times, Feb. 16, 1967]

THE TAX THAT HAS GROWN LIKE Topsy

The tax that has grown like Topsy, until it's now getting to be a monster and a mill-

stone around the neck of millions of workers and employers has the fancy name of Federal Insurance Contributions Act but is better known as Social Security. It started out on a modest 1 per cent basis and now has grown to where workers pay 4.4 per cent of their first \$6,000 of annual income, or a maximum of \$290.40 per year. The employer, whether he is making ends meet or not, must match it.

But we have a man in the White House who talks about the benefits he is going to give everyone, but makes no mention of the terrible tax increases he has in mind. LBJ's plan is to raise the rate to 5 per cent in 1969 and to 5.55 per cent in 1973. The taxable base would climb to \$7,800 in 1968 to \$9,000 in 1971, and to \$10,800 in 1974!

The 5.55 per cent rate and the \$10,800 base would mean a maximum annual Social Security and Medicare tax in 1974 of \$599.40 . . . or \$600 in round numbers. For some workers and employers it would mean their F.I.C.A. taxes would more than double within a seven-year period.

A \$600 tax for 20 years is \$12,000 just for one form of taxation, and this tax started out, you should keep in mind, at the maximum rate of \$30 a year! It illustrates what happens when a gang of politicians get the habit of spending other people's money and find a way to siphon it out of practically every pocket in these United States. They never stop raising the tax and the base . . . but if enough people yell loud enough and long enough and keep yelling . . . they might get scared of being booted out of the government trough and put on the brakes, and ease the pressure. And paying that tax now is plenty tough and is very likely to get rougher . . . not for some other guy but for you and I. Let the White House know through Congress what you think about paying for the benefits LBJ wants to trade for votes in 1968.

SOVIET STRATEGY TO CONTROL KEY MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ROUTES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since the nationalization by Egypt in 1956 of the Suez Canal and the impact of that event at Panama, I have repeatedly stressed in addresses, in and out of the Congress, that this startling occurrence was not an isolated matter but part of a worldwide pattern for gaining control of key maritime waterways and adjoining areas from which they can be dominated.

The strategic water routes and areas on which this struggle is now focused are the Suez Canal-Red Sea route, the Strait of Malacca in southeast Asia, the shipping lanes around the Cape of Good Hope, and the Panama Canal. The operations for the control of these arteries of transportation are far more advanced than is generally realized and behoove us to be alert.

As to the Panama Canal, the key issue is not the much discussed U.S. control over the Canal Zone versus Panamanian but U.S. sovereignty versus Communist control. In regard to the Suez Canal-Red Sea route, the Suez Canal is already dominated by Egypt,

which in turn is dominated by Soviet power. This means that this key waterway is already under effective Soviet control.

The projected withdrawal of British forces from Aden in 1968 will create a vacuum that Red power is already striving to fill. If successful, this effort will place control of the southern approach to the Suez waterway under Soviet power and serve to advance its influence in surrounding areas.

The latest information on the last is that arrangements have been made for the training of Eritreans in Red China and Soviet Cuba as guerrilla fighters and terrorists to reinforce the Eritrean "Liberation" army. If Soviet power succeeds in taking Eritrea and Aden in addition to its plans for the Suez Canal, it will be in a position to infiltrate and take over Ethiopia and the Republic of the Sudan. In the event of war between the Soviets and the United States or any other free nation, the Suez Canal would undoubtedly be operated as a Soviet waterway sealed off for the transit of all Western vessels of commerce of war.

As with the Suez Canal so with the Panama Canal. Soviet planning and strategy have long been directed toward taking over the latter. Red power has already obtained control of Cuba and is striving to establish its power in Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, the Guianas, and Colombia, all of which are indispensable protective areas for the Panama Canal.

Apropos the Suez Canal-Red Sea route, I quote a recent news story as part of my remarks:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 3, 1967]
CUBA SAID TO AGREE TO TRAIN ERITREAN GUERRILLAS—HAVANA IS REPORTED BACKING ANTI-REBELS—INSTRUCTION FOR TERRORISTS BY PEKING ALSO INDICATED

(By Eric Pace)

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA, March 2.—Cuba has agreed to train guerrilla fighters for an Eritrean secessionist movement, which has been waging a mounting campaign of terror and harassment against the Ethiopian central Government of Emperor Haile Selassie, informed sources reported yesterday.

The informants, who declined to be identified for publication, said the Moslem officers of the secessionist Eritrean Liberation Army had also been making arrangements to send men to Communist China for schooling in terrorist techniques to use against the predominantly Christian Addis Ababa regime.

There was no indication here when the Eritreans would arrive in Cuba or when they would return to reinforce the Liberation Army.

A half dozen Moslem Arab countries have been funneling money and equipment to the Liberation Army and its political arm, the Eritrean Liberation Front. The organizations want full independence for the 48,000-square mile former Italian colony of Eritrea, which was joined to Ethiopia in 1952.

EGYPTIANS AND SAUDIS VIE

The United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia, vying for influence in the Moslem world, have been among the principal supporters of the secessionist movement, which has been trying to rally the loyalty of the Moslem 70 per cent of Eritrea's population of 1.5-million to its crescent flag.

Armed with mortars and bazookas, and with heavier artillery reported hidden in reserve, the Eritrean Liberation Army terrorists have been waylaying trucks, disrupt-

ing rail traffic and blackmailing opponents intermittently.

Well organized despite the fact that they have no single outstanding leader, the Liberation Army and the Liberation Front are a continual embarrassment to Emperor Haile Selassie and the 6,000 Government [police force].

The Liberation Army, whose hard core numbers only 2,000 men at most, carries on its intermittent terrorism solely in Eritrea, a largely malaria-infested strip of land along the Red Sea.

Dissident Eritreans feel that their economic development has been neglected by the Emperor, who has concentrated on building up Addis Ababa as a showcase to engender pride among the Ethiopians and awe among the leaders of other African nations.

NO IMMEDIATE THREAT SEEN

The terrorists, who have no clearly defined ideological leanings, have not been effective enough to pose an immediate threat to the political stability in Eritrea. Their activities, however, are part of a broad jockeying for power by Moslem nations that is unsettling the Red Sea area.

Besides supporting the Eritreans, the United Arab Republic is backing anti-British terrorists in Aden, while Somalia, armed with Soviet weapons, hopes to annex French Somaliland if it gains independence.

Broadcasts from Cairo have been encouraging the Eritrean secessionists, and Somalia has been providing passports for them to use in traveling to Egypt, Iraq, and Syria for schooling and training.

The hard core of the terrorist has grown year by year since Eritrea was joined to Ethiopia, with the blessings of the United Nations, 15 years ago.

Africans returning from China have reported that Eritreans were already in training there, but these reports have never been confirmed. And it is considered unlikely that Peking would accept others for training now while its own domestic turmoil continues.

TRAVEL AGENT PROBLEMS RECEIVING INCREASED ATTENTION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, during the 89th Congress the Subcommittee on Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies of the House Small Business Committee held extensive hearings on the role of small business in air transportation. One of the central issues of these hearings was problems of small business travel agents and their relationship with scheduled air carriers and the Civil Aeronautics Board. The subcommittee received voluminous testimony to the effect that travel agents were being treated as "second-class citizens" as one witness put it.

Recently, a number of hopeful developments have occurred which suggest that increased attention is being given the problems of travel agents and that in the months ahead there may be substantial improvement in the conditions of which they complained during the Small Business Committee hearings.

One of the recommendations contained in the Small Business Committee's report on air transportation was:

It is recommended that the Civil Aeronautics Board designate one of its offices as the official forum for agent complaints. If, in the opinion of the Board, this would overburden existing personnel, then it is recommended that a new office be created for this purpose. Individual small business travel agents do not have Washington counsel, nor are they familiar enough with the complexities of CAB regulations that they always know which bureau or section they should go to with a particular matter. The intent of this recommendation is that travel agents have available to them an official to receive travel agent problems. It would be his responsibility to call to the attention of the Board or the appropriate members of the staff those problems being encountered by agents.

In January of this year Chairman Charles S. Murphy appointed his special assistant, Miss Joan Coward, to serve as the Board's principal liaison with travel agents. Travel Agent magazine published an article setting forth Miss Coward's views on her new position. Under unanimous consent I place this article in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

CAB LIAISON CHIEF: AGENT PROBLEMS TO BE EXPEDITED

(By James Hogg)

WASHINGTON.—Joan Coward says her new post as CAB Special Assistant on travel agent matters will be "mostly a job of listening" to agents' problems to see that they get proper consideration from the Board.

In her first interview since taking on the new responsibility, Miss Coward, a career civil servant, who likes to fly, told The Travel Agent that her job, as she sees it, will be to act as a "funnel" between agents and the Board to make certain letters and problems get to the right bureau or authority.

"If I see a letter from an agent that needs attention, I'll see that it gets it," she stated.

Miss Coward said she has "no plans at this time" to hold formal, regular meetings with ASTA or IATA officials.

However, she continued, "I do anticipate that I shall attend some industry meetings and hear agents' problems." She added that she hopes to work with industry leaders on an informal basis as problems arise.

Asked to name what she thought were the key problems straining relations between agents and the airlines, Miss Coward singled out "equal incentives," that is, more equitable commission rates for agents selling domestic tickets versus international transportation, and the regulations governing the present North Atlantic GIT fare.

"But as to how deeply the Board will get into this dispute, I don't know yet. It is mainly for the agents and carriers to work it out among themselves." She said the two groups "have to face up to a mutuality of interest," which might take the form of "more dialogue" and perhaps some sort of "formalized arrangement between the ATC and travel agents."

As to relations between airlines and the agents during the past year, Miss Coward said she thought they had improved, but urged closer cooperation in the future between agents, the ATC, and IATA.

The CAB still "doesn't see any need" for licensing of travel agents, she said, and told Congress of this. But if some kind of regulation does come, it should be only on the federal level. States should stay out of matters dealing with interstate transportation, she declared.

What does she think of the people she now

has to work with? "I think travel agents are extremely important to air transportation, and will be even more so in the future," she replied.

The committee report also contained the following recommendation:

It is recommended that travel agents and the Air Traffic Conference take all steps necessary to bring about regular meetings between carriers and agents' representatives for the purpose of discussing mutual problems. It is further recommended that the House Small Business Committee, during the 90th Congress, keep itself informed as to the degree to which this recommendation is implemented.

At its meeting on March 1, the Air Traffic Conference's Policy Committee reviewed means of improving liaison and communications with the travel agency industry. Concluding that such a program would be in the best interests of both travel agents and airlines, the ATC Policy Committee decided to approach the leaders of the various travel agent organizations for the purpose of organizing a meeting of such groups with the airline policy group to discuss the proper organization of a joint group for future discussions, the composition of such a group, and the broad subject areas where joint discussions would be fruitful. One of the matters requiring examination in this connection will be the representation on the joint group of travel agents which are not members of a travel agency organization.

Travel Weekly in its March 7 edition described this meeting in the following language:

[From the Travel Weekly, Mar. 7, 1967]

ATC SEEKS MEETING WITH AGENTS TO LIFT "DIALOG CURTAIN"

WASHINGTON, Mar. 3.—The domestic airlines this week took a first step to shatter the "communications barrier" between travel agents and carriers.

ATC's new Passenger Traffic Policy Advisory Committee voted to meet with agency representatives to seek ways and means to establish an "open dialogue" on trade matters.

The ATC is expected to place the proposal before ASTA, the Assn. of Retail Travel Agents and the Assn. of Bank Travel Bureaus within two weeks. The Creative Tour Operators Assn. and American Automobile Assn. may also be invited.

The need for closer agency-carrier relations was stressed strongly in a recent report of the House Small Business Subcommittee.

On another matter, the policy committee this week declined to recommend a stand on federal licensing of agents. The committee observed that no licensing proposal is currently before Congress.

In addition to these encouraging and commendable actions taken by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Air Traffic Conference, at least one of the major scheduled domestic air carriers has moved to work in closer cooperation with small business travel agents through an experimental ticket referral program.

This new program being conducted by American Airlines was also described in some detail in the February 14 issue of Travel Weekly. I ask unanimous consent that this description of the American Airlines referral project appear at this point in my remarks:

EXTEND AGENT REFERRAL PROJECT TO FOUR CITIES—AMERICAN TO PURSUE SUBURBAN EXPERIMENT AFTER ST. LOUIS TEST

(By Martin Deutsch)

NEW YORK, Feb. 3.—A ticket referral "experiment" conducted by American Airlines for suburban St. Louis travel agents will be extended in that area for another six months and also tested for a similar period in San Francisco, Cleveland and Washington, D.C.

Kept carefully under wraps until now, the program will be expanded to suburban areas nationally if the pilot projects are successful.

During a six-week period last November and December, American's telephone reservations staff in St. Louis referred 1261 ticket requests to the 17 participating travel agents—and of this number 264 clients, or 21%, actually went to the agencies as recommended.

It was on the basis of these "promising results" that American decided to expand the "trial" to four cities for an extended run. Sixteen of the 17 St. Louis agents were enthusiastic about the referrals, and the only negative reaction came from an agent who said he lacked the parking facilities to handle point-to-point ticket traffic.

In a spot-check, TRAVEL WEEKLY confirmed that the agents were highly laudatory, even though initially they were getting chiefly 5%, short-haul bookings. Travel agent Ed Tenholder had a typical reaction: "This program builds potential clients, educates people in our neighborhood to the fact that we are here, exposes airline travelers to an agency, and encourages traffic into our office."

American's management feels that referrals provide a concrete opportunity to show agents that "we genuinely want to work with them, that we are not merely giving lip-service to the trade when we say we want to do everything possible to cooperate with them and to better their revenues."

The carrier feels that the suburban referrals are a "solid service" to the customer, in that he does not have to travel to a city ticket office in a congested business district, or bother with ticket counter lines at the airports. The system has been confined to outlying communities where there are no CTO's, since the service would offer no advantage to clients who live in high-traffic areas.

"We think we've got a real hot item here for the agents," said an AA vice-president.

American has tried referral programs in the past, but they have been "ill-fated and short-lived" because of opposition by local sales and reservations personnel, and a serious build-up in telephone "holding time." In St. Louis, the reservations clerks were briefed and trained for weeks before the first trial period, and holding time was not appreciably affected during the six weeks.

NINE MAJOR STEPS

The plan works this way: (1) An AA reservations clerk gets a call for a ticket. (2) He asks for the basic passenger information, including name, address and telephone number. (3) From the telephone exchange he can tell whether the client lives in a suburban location, and then the Zip Code Number will further pin down the section.

(5) Working from a chart which gives him the name, address and phone number of the agent nearest the customer, he will recommend that the caller pick up his ticket at that travel agency. (6) In those rare cases where the passenger is equidistant from two agents, the airline clerk will give both addresses and allow the client to make the decision. (9) If the client prefers a ticket-by-mail, or prefers to pick it up at a CTO or at the airport, the clerk will handle the reservation.

In the instruction sheets, the procedure is

spelled out with great clarity for the airline staff. The clerk is advised to ask the caller whether it would be convenient for him to pick up his ticket by a specified date. If the answer is yes, he is told to follow up with: "Perhaps there is a travel agent close to you where it would be convenient to pick up a ticket. Let me check."

The sales and reservations people have also been told repeatedly that "it is very important that we do a thorough and efficient job on this experiment so that a true evaluation can be made and we can give accurate recommendations from the results."

American's St. Louis office reported that the chief reasons given by customers during the six-week experiment for not choosing to pick up the tickets from an agent were these:

Most of the 80% who declined the agency offer had never before done business with an agent. "Well, we've always picked it up downtown. . . ."

Thought they had to pay extra at an agency.

Getting the ticket by mail was easier. Preferred to go to a CTO either because of habit or convenience.

While none of the above developments are conclusive, they are indicative of a new climate within the air transportation industry in which both the carriers and the CAB are attempting to give greater consideration to the legitimate wants and needs of small business travel agents. In the months ahead my subcommittee will be watching with interest such further developments as may occur. It is our hope that the travel agents will, themselves, strive to work in a spirit of cooperation with other elements of the industry in seeking further improvement.

FROM BOY TO MAN IN THE JOB CORPS

MR. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

MR. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the story of the Job Corps, what it is, what it does, and how it helps in the fight against poverty, was presented in an interesting and informative fashion Sunday, March 5, in the weekly magazine of the St. Paul, Minn., Pioneer Press. Reporter-photographer Mike Zerby told the story through the eyes of his camera and the words of Mitchell Dozier, a corpsman at the Camp Isabella Conservation Center in the Superior National Forest.

This effort to enable poverty-bound young men and women "to correct weaknesses while discovering capabilities" is described in an article, the text of which I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD. The article is an adaptation of a story carried earlier by the Worthington, Minn., Globe.

For those Members of this House who have doubts, or want to know more, about the Job Corps, I especially recommend this brief but encouraging glimpse into the life of one of the young Americans this program is helping. Through basic education, training, and the development

of attitude and outlook, the Job Corps is bringing young men and women to say, like Mitchell Dozier, "I'm hoping that one day I will become somebody."

FROM BOY TO MAN IN THE JOB CORPS

(By Mike Zerby)

Mitchell Dozier used to hate himself.

He had only marginal reading ability and limited math skills. Finding a good job and a satisfying way of life seemed impossible. "I hated myself because I didn't finish high school."

Now he is a member of the Job Corps, discovering himself, his capabilities and limitations. He is getting a basic education, learning a trade and acquiring hope for the future.

To become a corpsman, boys between 16 and 21 must be citizens, have no criminal record, be school dropouts and unable to find or hold adequate jobs. Family income must be less than \$3,500 a year.

The 30,000 corpsmen are scattered throughout the country in 111 camps. Dozier arrived at Camp Isabella, in the Superior National Forest 90 miles northeast of Duluth, a year ago. His first impression of the camp: "A very beautiful place."

He is one of 224 boys being rehabilitated in group living, education, work projects designed to correct weaknesses while discovering capabilities.

Corpsmen come from many places. To separate them from their old, presumably undesirable, environment they usually attend a camp more than 300 miles from home.

With so many new faces from differing backgrounds, Mitch, like many corpsmen, was initially "sort of lonely." But now he "has a lot of friends at camp."

"Life is always work," said Mitch, and group living is a full-time job.

He is a leader in Dorm 4. Thomas McDonald said Mitch was selected because he likes people and wants to help them. "He's a good leader."

"As a leader I have to see that the guys always get up on time, that they cooperate in group living and do what is necessary," said Mitch. This includes housekeeping and maintenance in the dorm.

Complaints are aired at dorm meetings. There are some problems and flareups, but "most of the guys, if you take time to talk with them, will straighten out," said Dozier.

Only 31 disciplinary discharges have occurred.

Group living is considered a most important part of the program.

"Getting an education is important," for Mitch. "I will be satisfied when that is done."

Education is composed of reading, math, driver education, world of work and a trade. Corpsmen spend 40 per cent of their time in class, the rest working. Tests determine educational levels and the students progress at their own speeds.

Mitch started reading at second grade level, is now at ninth grade level, will reach twelfth grade level before leaving. He is studying algebra and typing and in driver education he is learning about bulldozers and graders.

As a result of the world-of-work course, Mitch hopes to become a volunteer in VISTA, another anti-poverty program. By helping others in need of help, he feels he can "sort of pay back" for the help given him.

Corpsmen completing the program should be able to compete with the average high school graduate.

Work at the camp gives practical experience, mostly in forestry and conservation. They have built parts of Camp Isabella, including a gym; thinned forests, built campsites and roads.

"Mitch has progressed quite well," said Nate Nelson, a camp official. "He's willing. He works. He doesn't goof off. He's develop-

ing a sense of responsibility. This is part of what we're trying to do."

The gym is a needed part of recreation at the camp. They have a fledgling basketball team in the Silver Bay league. There is also a recreation hall with pool table and movies.

But after learning and working all week, what does a teenager want to do? Go on a date—with a girl!

On weekends corpsmen go to Ely, Silver Bay, sometimes Duluth, with transportation provided.

But a new face in a small town is not always welcome. As Mitch put it, "the girls used to look at the corpsmen pretty hard. They didn't know what the program was. People are suspicious and want to know where we come from. If we carry ourselves properly, people will realize we aren't a bunch of hoodlums."

Ely assistant police chief Joseph Baltich, agreed. "There has not been as much trouble as initially expected. The only real incident (a smashed dome light on a police car) included the local kids and it just kind of snowballed. We had to bar the corpsmen from town for a month." The boy involved was discharged from the corps.

The incident led to the establishment of a courtesy patrol, much like the military police. Two corpsmen patrol the towns.

"Since the CPs have been on the job, no trouble," said Baltich.

A teenage waitress in Ely said "the guys behave real nice, maybe they even try too hard to be nice."

Mitch said Ely is friendly. "People have been real nice to me."

Relations have steadily improved. Duluth Cathedral high school invited 30 corpsmen to a basketball game. Ten Silver Bay families invited boys to dinner.

Progress is being made.

But what has all this cost, taking a boy and making a man?

Approximately \$7,500 a year per man, according to E. M. Brickner, education director.

"But compare this with the cost of supporting a man and his family on relief for who-knows-how-many years," said Brickner.

"Even more important, what is the value of knowing you can earn a decent living and respect of others?"

It will be several years before the real worth is known.

But, for Mitchell Dozier, he doesn't have to hate himself anymore. He wants to complete his training, marry his girl and work in VISTA.

"This is sort of like a dream world to me," he said. "I am hoping that one day I will become somebody."

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XXXI

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, some proponents of universal military training argue that, as long as a few young men are being called upon to serve in the Armed Forces, why then should not all eligible young men be required to spend some time in the service. I believe this argument can best be refuted by inserting, at this point in the RECORD,

the following story told by Prof. David Bakan of the University of Chicago:

THE MUDDY STREET

One of the streets of Gotham was in bad condition. Each time a wagon would pass it would throw mud at the people on the sidewalk, especially those close to the curb. The wise men of Gotham gathered to deliberate what course of action they should take with respect to it. In the course of their deliberations it was pointed out that it was very unfair that those who were near the curb should be splattered while others were not. The Council of Gotham therefore passed a law requiring all citizens on the street to line up at the curb whenever a wagon was to pass.

RAMSEY CLARK: AN EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Ramsey Clark has just become the 66th Attorney General of the United States. I want to express my congratulations both to Mr. Clark and to the President who appointed him. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have had the pleasure of consulting with our new Attorney General and I am happy to have the opportunity to continue to work with him on legislative issues of mutual concern to our committee and to the Justice Department.

Mr. Clark's appointment was an outstanding one which has been widely acclaimed throughout the Nation. Numerous newspaper editorials have recognized Mr. Clark for what he is: a most dedicated and competent public servant. Several of these editorials have come to my attention, and I include in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

[From Newsday]

AN EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT

President Johnson has named Acting Attorney General Ramsey Clark, the son of Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark, as attorney general to succeed Nicholas Katzenbach.

The appointment, on all counts, is excellent. Ramsey Clark at 39 is a young man who gets things done. President Kennedy appointed him an assistant attorney general in charge of the lands division six years ago. During each of three years he turned back \$300,000 of his division's \$3,500,000 budget. With the permission of Congress he reduced his staff from 244 persons to 220. Both were most unusual actions in an era when government jobs and spending tend to proliferate.

A quiet man, he has effectively combined a civil libertarian stance with a strong concern for the rate at which crime is growing in this country. He is the kind of lawyer a private citizen would want to handle his case were that citizen in trouble.

It is a matter of regret, but of course fitting, that his father, the justice, will retire in order to avoid any conflict of interest. Mr. Justice Clark has been an admirably forthright member of the court. Judging from President Johnson's past record of judicial appointments, he can be relied upon to replace Clark with someone equally dedicated.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 1967]

NEW ATTORNEY GENERAL

President Johnson followed the logical course in naming Ramsey Clark to be Attorney General. In the position of Deputy Attorney General under Nicholas Katzenbach, Mr. Clark proved to be a dedicated public servant and an administrator of substantial ability. Since Mr. Katzenbach's reassignment to the State Department last September, Mr. Clark has presided over the Department of Justice as acting Attorney General with poise and good judgment as well as alertness and energy. President Johnson could scarcely have passed him by in making a permanent appointment without discouraging the kind of public service that he most prizes.

If Mr. Clark had been chosen from private life at the age of 39, questions would have been raised about his experience and knowledge of governmental problems. But having risen to the top within the Department, he is in the position, despite his age, of being the most experienced man for the job. Though quiet by nature and cautious in charting his course, he appears to have a keen sense of right and wrong and ample courage to act on his convictions.

This community has special reason to be grateful to Mr. Clark for his wise advice to the President to veto the District crime bill passed by Congress last year. In a delicate position because of his uncertain status and because of the mounting volume of crime in Washington, he held fast to constitutional principles of a sociologically sound approach to the problem. Since he is known to be a liberal with his feet on the ground, we surmise that this incident may well provide an index to the kind of service he will render as Attorney General.

The President has done well to promote a highly promising public servant, and we think the response of the country as well as that of the Senate will be enthusiastic.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, Mar. 2, 1967]

THE NEW ATTORNEY GENERAL

President Johnson's selection of Ramsey Clark as Attorney General is clearly one of the most distinguished Cabinet appointments he has made.

In a public service career which began early in the Kennedy Administration, Mr. Clark has repeatedly demonstrated quiet courage, calm compassion and a professional commitment to not only the letter but also the spirit of the law. He is known in Washington as a skillful administrator; in other cities, in the South and Far West, he became known as a sensitive, effective troubleshooter in civil rights crises.

As Deputy Attorney General, he was a powerful executive officer for Nicholas Katzenbach; one of his most memorable public appearances last summer was a terse lecture on free speech and constitutional law to the House Un-American Activities Committee, which sought to penalize Vietnam war protesters. As Acting Attorney General, since last fall, he has run the Department of Justice with the accent on "justice"—ordering a review of federal convictions obtained with wiretap evidence and persuading the President to veto a flawed crime bill.

Mr. Clark is a quietly outspoken man and his enlightened views on law, law enforcement and penology will undoubtedly be challenged by zealous reactionaries inside and outside his department. On the day of his nomination, in fact, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover was assailing "excessive compassion for criminals." Mr. Clark has indicated that he regards the FBI as an arm of the Justice Department, not as an independent agency, and his firmness is likely to be tested soon. He gives every promise of being able to meet the test.

Mr. Clark's father, Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark, has felt obliged to step down from the court to avoid any possible conflict of interest in ruling on the many cases the government presents to the court. We respect the decision and we hope the Senate will speedily confirm the new Attorney General.

MEDAL OF HONOR PRESENTATION TO SP. 6 LAWRENCE JOEL, U.S. ARMY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GALLIFIANAKIS] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the more pleasant duties of a Member of this House is to praise a constituent for an outstanding contribution to his Nation.

On March 9, the President of the United States, acting under an act of Congress, awarded in the name of the U.S. Congress the highest commendation this Nation can give for valor and gallantry above and beyond the call of duty to a member of the U.S. armed services.

In moving and appropriate ceremonies at the White House, the President awarded the Medal of Honor to Sp. 6 Lawrence Joel for his heroic actions as a medical aidman with the 1st Airborne Battalion of the 503d Infantry during a battle with the enemies of democracy in Vietnam.

We of North Carolina were proud of this honor to a native son, and the following members of our delegation joined with me in paying our respect to Specialist Joel at the ceremonies: Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, Hon. JAMES C. GARDNER, Hon. WALTER B. JONES, Hon. HORACE R. KORNEGAY, Hon. ALTON A. LENNON, and Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that Specialist Joel is the first medical corpsman to receive this honor during our struggle in Vietnam. During the entire day and night of November 8, 1965, Specialist Joel, wounded twice and constantly exposed to intense enemy fire, moved across that fiercely contested battlefield saving the lives of his wounded comrades and encouraging his unit to stand fast and resist the enemy attack.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to claim Specialist Joel as a constituent. A Winston-Salem, N.C., native, he has, during his 21 years in the service of his country, displayed a level of conduct and gallantry which we all aspire to.

I therefore include in the Record the text of the citation read by the President at yesterday's ceremonies honoring Specialist Joel as a fitting ratification by this body of the President's action in our behalf:

CITATION

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of

the Congress the Medal of Honor to Specialist Six Lawrence Joel, United States Army for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty:

Specialist Six Lawrence Joel (then Specialist Five) distinguished himself by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty on November 8, 1965, while serving as a Medical Aidman, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion (Airborne), 503rd Infantry on a battlefield in the Republic of Vietnam. Specialist Joel demonstrated indomitable courage, determination, and professional skill when a numerically superior and well-concealed Viet Cong element launched a vicious attack which wounded or killed nearly every man in the lead squad of the Company. After treating the men wounded by the initial burst of gun fire, he bravely moved forward to assist others who were wounded while proceeding to their objective. While moving from man to man, he was struck in the right leg by machine gun fire.

Although painfully wounded his desire to aid his fellow soldiers transcended all personal feeling. He bandaged his own wound and self administered morphine to deaden the pain enabling him to continue his dangerous undertaking. Throughout this period of time, he constantly shouted words of encouragement to all around him. Then, completely ignoring the warnings of others, and his own pain, he continued his search for wounded exposing himself to hostile fire; and, as bullets dug up the dirt around him, he held plasma bottles high while kneeling completely engrossed in his life saving mission. Then, after being struck a second time and with a bullet lodged in his thigh, he dragged himself over the battlefield and succeeded in treating thirteen more men before his medical supplies ran out. Displaying resourcefulness, he saved the life of one man by placing a plastic bag over a severe chest wound to congeal the blood. As one of the platoons pursued the Viet Cong, an insurgent force in concealed positions opened fire on the platoon and wounded many more soldiers. With a new stock of medical supplies, Specialist Joel again shouted words of encouragement as he crawled through an intense hail of gun fire to the wounded men.

After the twenty-four hour battle subsided and the Viet Cong dead numbered four hundred and ten, snipers continued to harass the Company. Throughout the long battle, Specialist Joel never lost sight of his mission as a Medical Aidman and continued to comfort and treat the wounded until his own evacuation was ordered. His meticulous attention to duty saved a large number of lives and his unselfish, daring example under most adverse conditions was an inspiration to all. Specialist Joel's profound concern for his fellow soldiers, his conspicuous gallantry, and his intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty are in the highest traditions of the United States Army and reflect great credit upon himself and the armed forces of his country.

SECURITY IN THE HEMISPHERE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to call attention to the impending departure of the President of the

United States for Punta del Este, Uruguay, where he will participate in a meeting of historic importance and interest for the people of the Western Hemisphere. I refer to the meeting of American Chiefs of State which will be held there from April 12-14.

This gathering of the Chief Executives of the hemisphere is charged with the tremendous responsibility of accelerating the economic and social development of Latin America and its 200 million people. It is a task to which, under the Alliance for Progress, the United States has devoted over a billion dollars a year for the past 5 years, and to which we propose to devote even greater amounts in the years ahead.

In my opinion this is a sound investment. It can, in fact, be considered in many ways to be money spent in our own interest; for the future welfare, security, and prosperity of our own people are inextricably tied to the welfare, security, and prosperity of our neighbor nations to the south.

In this vein, I wish our President and his colleagues all success in their deliberations.

The implications of this gathering of statesmen for the future well-being and security of our hemisphere are of great importance. As we are all aware, the protection of the free nations of our part of the world from totalitarian aggression and intrusion, whether economic or military, is a joint responsibility of all our governments and all our peoples. This agreement to share the burdens of our self protection was formalized in the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of 1948, commonly known as the Rio Treaty.

However, the true security of the nations of this hemisphere rests not in troops or warplanes or warships, but in the manner in which we utilize the skills and resources available to us to further the welfare and progress of our peoples. It is interesting to note that the draft agenda prepared for the meeting of American Chiefs of State specifically recognizes this problem with the inclusion of an item "Elimination of Unnecessary Military Expenditure."

I believe it is correct to say that the presence of this item on the agenda reflects an awareness on the part of our own Government and the governments of Latin America that if economic and social progress is to be accelerated—and this is the primary purpose of the Punta del Este meeting—there must be an intelligent and careful distribution of available wealth and resources between the legitimate demands of military defense, and those of development.

Clearly, the nations of the hemisphere need to maintain effective military forces in being. But we need to be aware at the same time that the best way to deal with the challenge posed by militant communism in this hemisphere, as in the world at large, is through the development of politically strong and economically prosperous societies, based on social justice for the individual and respect for constitutional procedures.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me proper to call attention to this important aspect of the work which President Johnson and his Latin American colleagues will be undertaking, and to wish them well as they prepare to leave on their historic journey.

MEXICO—AND EXEMPLARY PROGRESS WITHIN THE ALLIANCE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing full confidence in the leadership of the President, as he and his team prepare for the historic meeting of American Chief Executives. I warmly approve of his message.

As we are aware, this summit conference at Punta del Este next month will, in effect, chart a course for the Alliance for Progress in the coming years. The Presidents and their advisers will be discussing broad policies and programs which will affect all the member countries.

Though Punta del Este is far away, the effects of the Alliance for Progress are near at hand. For example, let me draw your attention to what has been happening under the Alliance to our nearest Latin American neighbor, the United States of Mexico. Here we can observe the Alliance at close range.

Other countries have received far more by way of financial aid from the United States but today Mexico stands as one of the leaders among the Alliance nations.

Mexico has, in fact, been meeting the economic development and social reform goals set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este. The country has enjoyed a steady flow of private investment capital from abroad and much of the urban population is enjoying an improved standard of living.

Mexico's GNP has been climbing steadily; it has been increasing in real terms at an average rate of 6.1 percent annually. On a per capita basis this has meant a 2.6-percent annual increase. The present annual growth rate is about 7 percent.

With the peso stabilized at 12.50 per dollar since 1954, Mexico's record of fiscal responsibility is outstanding. The International Monetary Fund announced last year that the Mexican peso would be used for lending to countries requesting standby credits to meet temporary balance-of-payments problems. Strict Government controls have successfully checked inflation.

Mexico's tax reforms have greatly increased tax revenues. Current collections are about 8 percent of GNP.

In 1961 Mexico initiated an 11-year plan for education which called for the construction of over 27,000 rural classrooms, almost 12,000 urban classrooms, and the addition of about 6,000 new

teachers each year. In 1966 the Government proudly announced that the 11-year educational plan had been completed 7 years ahead of schedule.

Mexico's social revolution was the forerunner of the great progress which she is now making as an Alliance partner. Many of the principles of the Charter of Punta del Este are written into her national legislation. Under the effective agrarian reform program, Mexico's agricultural production is increasing at a compound rate of some 5.5 percent per year; while her population is growing at about 3.5 percent, leaving a surplus of food production.

Over the past decade Mexico's industrial production has about doubled. Exports in 1966 exceeded \$1.2 billion with increasing diversification, while imports topped \$1.6 billion.

As a member of the Latin American Free Trade Association, Mexico is showing increased interest in the economic integration movement. It has signed the International Coffee Agreement and in the past 2 years has focused its attention on the Central American Common Market with offers of technical and concessional trade agreements.

In the past several years the private sector has channeled significant amounts of savings into low-cost housing and agricultural credit. In public health services, the government has scored great progress in reducing infant mortality, malaria, and the incidence of infectious diseases. Yellow fever has been eradicated; malaria persists only in a few isolated tropical areas.

Most important in Mexico's strides under the Alliance is the fact that the country's development is being financed with domestic resources. In 1964 and 1965, the private sector financed more than 75 percent of this development. In 1966 private foreign investment contributed at least \$185 million toward the country's industrial and agricultural growth.

The country has identified her own development aspirations with those of the Alliance. The Mexican Commission for the Alliance for Progress has sponsored six regional conferences to focus on the country's development problems. Five hundred delegates attended the conference in Guanajuato, with 350 participating in the working sessions. Special railroad cars brought participants from Mexico City, including the ambassadors of six Alliance member countries.

So long as Mexico retains the economic capacity to finance her internal development, the role of the United States is to encourage international institutions, private sources, and credit agencies to assist Mexico in meeting certain priorities, especially those which contribute to rural development. Similarly, technical assistance can be obtained from non-AID sources or financed by Mexico herself. The AID Mission is stimulating such assistance from non-AID sources, to assure the effective implementation of AID loans and projects already underway.

AID loans total \$66.5 million and include \$41.5 million for supervised agricultural credit and rural development; \$20 million for the construction of low-

cost housing, in a consortium with the Inter-American Development Bank which made a \$10-million loan; \$2.0 million for expanding and improving the National Agricultural Center at Chapingo, and \$3 million for expanding and improving the Autonomous University of Guadalajara.

Our loan program has strengthened two important institutions, one to meet the credit needs of small farmers called FONDO; and the other to finance low-cost social interest housing called FOVI.

More than 16,000 Mexican farmers are now receiving credit and technical assistance under the Agricultural Credit Program. A total of 10,700 low-cost housing units have been completed or are under construction under the U.S. assisted housing program.

In technical assistance AID has provided for an exchange of 25 professors under a contract with the University of California at Los Angeles and the Mexican National Polytechnic Institute.

Under the partners of the Alliance program, relations have been established between California and the State of Lower California, Sinaloa, Nayarit, and Puebla; between the States of Iowa and Yucatan, and between Oklahoma and Tlaxcala.

Under a contract with the University of New Mexico, some 200 Mexican rural youth leaders will travel to the United States for a 1-month training and indoctrination course soon.

In cooperation with the Mexican Government, American voluntary agencies and Mexican industrialists, AID has assisted many rural communities in realizing small self-help community development projects, such as the construction of rural access roads, potable water systems, schools, irrigation works, and agricultural cooperatives.

Under a contract with the American Institute of Free Labor Development, assistance has been given to the Mexican trade union movement by providing scholarships at the ORIT Labor College in Cuernavaca. Members of the Institute staff teach at the ORIT College and direct social projects work at the John F. Kennedy Housing Development in Mexico City.

The Ex-Im Bank has contributed substantially to Mexico's development with loans to finance capital imports from the United States. At the end of 1966 outstanding authorizations totaled \$529.68 million.

The World Bank has authorized loans totaling \$612.3 million up to the close of 1966. These are concentrated in the fields of power and transportation, with lesser amounts in industry. Agricultural loans totaled \$52.5 million.

The Inter-American Development Bank is participating with AID in the low-cost housing program. Other IDB assistance includes \$84 million in the agricultural sector; \$54 million for rural feeder roads, and about \$36 million for water and sewerage, surveys, industry, and program assistance.

It is certain that with a program like this, bolstered by her own resources and indomitable revolutionary spirit, the peo-

ple and the Republic of Mexico can take just pride in her achievements as a partner in the Alliance for Progress. She has not only succeeded in raising the living standards of her own people but is already sharing her technical and financial resources with the neighboring Central American Republics.

I think it is the consensus here to express our admiration for Mexico's exemplary progress and to wish her well in the years to come.

THE "MAN WHO OWNED MIDNIGHT" MOVES TO LOS ANGELES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on the first of March, Washington lost one of its most popular radio personalities to the west coast. Steve Allison, familiar to most Washingtonians as the "Man Who Owned Midnight," left the District of Columbia after almost 10 years as the host of a "talk show" on WWDC. I know that many of my colleagues had the opportunity to appear on Steve's show since Congressmen were among his favorite conversation partners. Because Steve loved to take the role of the devil's advocate on any issue, his guests were assured a lively and challenging evening. Always well informed about his guest's topic of discussion, he could frequently lead one on a merry chase through the conversational thicket.

Washington will miss Steve Allison's nightly show and his natural aptitude for bringing out the best, and occasionally the worst, in a wide variety of guests. Talk is still the main commodity produced in Washington, but the city is not the same without one of its major promoters. I wish Steve much luck in Los Angeles at station KABC where he will begin broadcasting tonight.

I would like to insert after my remarks several articles which describe Steve's long career in Washington radio and as a personality in his own right.

THE MAN WHO OWNS MIDNIGHT

When Steve Allison or one of his guests run out of words, they play a record. Since this happens only on the rarest of occasions there is very little music on *The Steve Allison Show*, heard Monday through Saturday, from 10:30 P.M. to 1 A.M., over Washington's Station WWDC. Known around the capital as "the man who owns midnight," Steve invites the great, the near-great and the men-in-the-street to stir up their controversies with him. . . . A typical, no-holds-barred evening might include comic Jerry Lewis, economist Robert Nathan, Washington Police Chief Robert Murray, a Senator, an anonymous representative of Alcoholics Anonymous, and belly-dancer Nejla Ates. The hotter the issue, the happier is Steve, and he warms things up even further on his "open forum." This is the time when he invites the radio audience to pick up their phones and argue "live" with him or his guests. . . . During the Suez crisis, Steve had an Israeli and an Arab on to exchange accusations. "They almost blew the roof off," he says. But that

was calm compared to the night Steve took up the question of whether or not taxis should have meters. He asked the cab drivers themselves to drive up to the Ceres Restaurant—whence the program originates—and honk once if they wanted meters, twice if they didn't. At midnight, 200 cabs came pouring down Pennsylvania Avenue. "All I heard was one long honk," Steve comments. . . . Born in Malden, Massachusetts, Steve spent a foot-loose youth with his mother and his actor-father, Barney Allison, a star of the era of four-a-day vaudeville. Steve himself drifted into radio from GI theatricals in the China-Burma-India theater of operations and the New York stage. He "borrowed" his controversial format from Jack Eigen and had aired it in Boston and Philadelphia before arriving in Washington this past June. . . . Steve makes his residence in a "fashionable" 16th Street apartment which he, his wife Wanda, and their children—Barnaby Adam, 3, and Amy Elizabeth, 2—have turned into a home for stray animals. On the welcoming committee for homeless four-footers are a cocker spaniel named Pepe Le Moko and a pair of parakeets called Mr. and Mrs. Tweets. . . . When Steve goes off the air at 1 A.M., he goes home to at least six hours of reading medical journals, the Congressional Record, books, periodicals, and a minimum of eight newspapers. "I have to keep ahead of my guests," he explains. He retires in the morning, breakfasts at dinnertime, and keeps midnight up his sleeve.

VEGETARIANS BEWARE—WWDC'S MIDNIGHT OWNER SERVES UP MANY A BITING DISH: DIVERSE OPINIONS ALLISON'S MEAT

Conversation is a lively art in Washington, the principal pursuit at parties, meetings and coffee breaks. But nowhere in the capital is it as vigorously—or persistently pursued as on Station WWDC every night except Sunday.

The man who stirs up all the celebration and articulation is Steve Allison, billed as "The Man Who Owns Midnight." Steve is neither disc jockey, traditional commentator, gushing host for fatuous celebrities or funny-man.

For two-and-a-half hours (10:30 p.m. to 1 a.m. each night he presides normally from a dais in the Peking Restaurant, moderating, provoking, arguing among a gaggle of miscellaneous guests ranging from Castro to cancer researchers, Ambassadors to Girl Scouts, Doctors, lawyers, merchants and chiefs, hot rodders and safety experts, cause pleaders and iconoclasts.

Variety is the spice of the Allison show but the yeast that makes it rise and keep listeners awake is Steve's own strongly-opinionated management of the interviews and his frequent soliloquies on any given—or self-selected—subject.

If this provocative nocturnal talkfest keeps some 50,000 to 60,000 people in the Washington area glued to their radios, it also rouses plenty of passion among them. Some who disagree get hopping mad; some who agree with a particular Allison crusade think he's the greatest. But most people enjoy the exchange of views, the spirit of controversy and debate which help ventilate the issues of the day—little or great.

In spite of his flair for showmanship and tendency to switch moods too abruptly at times, that is essentially what Steve Allison tries to do: make people listen and make people think.

Although he makes no effort to hide his personal views, he is fair in presenting "the other side." Superficial listeners do not always give him credit for that but faithful fans are aware he strives for this kind of balance.

Steve, who has been doing this WWDC stint for the past two and a half years, has interviewed many Members of Congress dur-

ing this period—but he'd like to have many more come up to his mikes.

He feels Congressmen make the best subject for his kind of program. They're usually quick in debate, used to talking and are well-grounded on important issues, he points out.

Steve usually plays the "devil's advocate" in these exchanges, says: "If I'm talking to a Republican, I'm a Democrat. If I'm interviewing a Democrat, I'm a Republican."

But no matter what the subject—or how heated the talk—Steve tries to emphasize issues and not personalities. "We're not interested in personal affairs or gossip," he avers. "If a man doesn't want to answer a question, we don't high pressure him or insist on pinning him down. We want to have people here who will present both sides of the picture."

To get more Congressmen on his program, Allison sent out invitations to all Members at the beginning of each session of the 86th Congress.

"In the two and a half years I've been in Washington I've had almost a hundred Congressmen on the program," Allison says.

Covering the wall in a corner on the Peking restaurant are pictures of Allison with many Members who've appeared on the program.

A few Congressmen liked their interviews with Allison so much they asked for taped recordings. At campaign time, the interviews were played back in the home districts so their constituents could hear what they had to say.

Allison and the Members don't always agree, "But we always part friends and remain friends," he smiles.

Allison and Rep. Alvin M. Bentley, (Mich), didn't entirely see eye-to-eye on certain issues. "But I consider him a close friend," Allison says, "and we did discuss the possibility of my working for his station in Saginaw, Michigan."

To keep in shape mentally for his discussions with the experts Allison reads some eight hours a day. "I've got to know what I'm doing. There are men who eat, drink and sleep certain issues."

"If I'm going to ask intelligent questions, I have to have a grasp of the subject."

What is Allison's idea of the ideal interview?

"I'd like to get the two candidates for the Presidency up in front of my mike," he says, "in a two and a half hour talk with me in the middle."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PYROTECHNICS SET TOWN ON EARS

(By Jay Lewis)

WASHINGTON, December 30.—The polite townfolk here winced when a leather-lunged radio opinionator barged into their political china shop about 18 months ago.

Washington is the melting pot of controversy, but there's a decorous tendency to keep it under the lid of the Capitol or other official debating arenas.

The tussle of naked opinion over Steve Allison's "talk" show confounded and offended. But while the citizenry reddened and winced they listened. Allison's weeknightly (10:35 p.m.-1 a.m.) free-for-all over WWDC radio has been copping the top Pulse ratings for the time slot, and he's billed as "The Man Who Owns Midnight."

An old hand at being an angry young man, Allison came here from WPEN in Philadelphia. There, with a similar format, he whipped up a crusade against McCarthyism, earned the lasting enmity of the lunatic fringe and began carrying a gun.

He's still carrying it. In Washington, Allison has been sounding off for racial tolerance and integration. He stiff-arms the bigot with such invectives as "goon" and "coward." This tends to stir the cranks out of the woodwork. Allison forwards all the anonymous threats to the FBI.

Based in a downtown Chinese restaurant,

Allison musters an assortment of lawmakers, nightclub performers, lobbyists, psychiatrists, etc. for offbeat interviews. Allison's change-of-pace artist and a showman who can follow-up bawdiness with light humor, and ferocity with calm rhetoric keeps the program in high gear, if it doesn't please the gram-marians.

When Allison is alone on the stand, he gets into telephone altercations with irate listeners, or simply relies on his own remarkable loquacity.

Highly opinionated, there's no middle-ground for Allison on most issues. And whether he's for or against, it's strictly from feeling. He can work up a fearsome wrath over the arbitrariness of a House committee chairman who bottles up bills he doesn't like ("I think it's just a horrible thing."). Or returning pre-war assets to the Germans ("I wouldn't give them a cap pistol"). Or home-rule for Washington ("Southern Congressmen don't want a Negro mayor"). Or the American Legion, the McClellan Committee, the starving children of Washington's slums . . .

Allison's experiment in free-swinging speech has enjoyed the loyal support of WWDC prexy Ben Strouse who gave him full rein to plunge into the Negro question in the fall of 1957. Allison began by airing a joint interview between a Virginia segregationist and an NAACP official. Other volatile duels have followed, and Allison has been accused of stirring up racial strife by the same people who demand he depart for Russia or some place even further beyond the pale.

Because of his refusal to stay on the fence, Allison takes some bumps when jumping off. The crank threats have extended to his wife and two children. He's lost a couple of sponsors (but replaced them), and moved his operations twice from previous restaurant locations. As Allison says, "If you can't talk freely in Washington, where can you?"

"We were not only impressed but amazed with your ability to keep talking and still make such good sense. Truly, I have never seen or heard a program like yours."—George Seaton, Producer.

"You really are an interesting man and ask very pertinent questions, and you handle your guests marvelously."—Josh Logan.

"I have been on radio and television from coast to coast these past ten years and the half-hour with you was the most stimulating I have ever spent before the mike."—William P. McCahill, Executive Secretary, The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

"We are grateful for the public service you have rendered."—U.S. Senator Joseph S. Clark, Jr. (Pa.).

"It is always a pleasure to appear on your show then sit back and wait for the comments from your large listening audience."—Representative William H. Ayres (Ohio).

"I marvelled at your intellectual grasp of such a variety of things."—Carl F. Hansen, Supt. of Schools, District of Columbia.

"Steve Allison keeps himself in key with his guests and could give a lesson to Mike Wallace in this respect."—Dave Reque, Washington Daily News.

"It is Allison's show to make or break, and he turns out to be one of the most vivid personalities around."—Harry Lando, Radio-Television Daily.

[From TV Life, December 1961]

RADIO STAR OF THE MONTH

Though controversy is nothing new in Washington, D.C., radio star Steve Allison deliberately stirs it up six nights a week over Station WWDC. *The Steve Allison Show*, heard from 9:45 to midnight, is spicy, full of variety, steam and good humor. Highly opinionated Steve—and he admits it—interviews mostly politicians and entertainers, but will talk to anyone—belly dancers, doctors,

irate telephoners, Indian chiefs. Their one qualification—they must have some viewpoint to add to the conversation. Topics range from integration to home-rule for Washington, foreign policy to the problem of the slums. Quick with the quip, the outspoken radio veteran manages to keep both his guests and his 60,000 listeners on their toes, which is exactly what he means to do. For example, when Castro first visited the U.S. in 1959, he spied Steve doing a live radio show and yelled, "What's going on?" Steve promptly retorted, "What do you think this is, mister—a barber shop?"

Born in Malden, Mass., Steve was early exposed to show biz via his vaudeville performing father, Barney Allison. After almost four years of military service and five battle stars, Steve headed for the bright Broadway lights as production manager for *Call Me Mister*. Soon he became a smash radio hit with shows in Boston, then Philly. The next step—the Capitol and WWDC. He and his lovely wife Wanda live in a fashionable city apartment with their two children, Barney and Amy. Steve spends up to ten hours a day reading five newspapers and every magazine he can get his hands on—"to be informed and ready for my guests," he explains. In his spare (?) time, Steve fences and does a little amateur flying. Future ambitions? To do the same type of interview show on television. When and if this happens, his listeners agree Steve will give Jack Paar a good run for his money!

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF NEGRO CHURCHMEN REGARDING THE POWELL CASE

MR. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

MR. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a statement by the National Committee of Negro Churchmen regarding the case of Adam Clayton Powell. This carefully considered statement comes as a breath of fresh air following the emotional furor of the action of this body on yesterday. I would like to commend the ministers who signed this statement for their wisdom and objective viewpoint on a most controversial and heated issue.

The statement follows:

THE POWELL AFFAIR—A CRISIS OF MORALS AND FAITH

FEBRUARY 1967.

DEAR FRIENDS: We are pleased to provide you with the following statement of the urgent need for congressional reform at this point in the history of our nation. While the statement focuses on the action of Congress against Congressman-elect Adam Clayton Powell, the analysis is shaped throughout by a concern for congressional procedures that will help to insure justice both to individual congressmen and to the American people.

The statement is the result of individual and group reflection by clergymen of the National Committee of Negro Churchmen. This informal group of more than 200 churchmen from across the nation seeks to witness to their faith in Jesus Christ through study and action which relate the Christian faith to some of the crises of our day. As we see it, the action against Powell is a "crisis of faith."

We hope you will find this statement helpful as you reflect upon and respond to the political problems of our nation.

For the National Committee of Negro Churchmen:

Bishop G. Wayman Blakeley, African Meth. Episc. Church.

The Rev. Dr. Edler Hawkins, United Presb. Church USA.

The Rev. Dr. Sandy Ray, President, Empire State Baptist State Convention.

Bishop Herbert Bell Shaw, African Meth. Episc. Zion Church.

The Rev. Joseph Coles, Jr., Christian Meth. Episc. Church.

The Rev. Dr. Nathan Wright, The Protestant Episc. Church.

The Rev. Dr. Sterling Cary, United Church of Christ.

Bishop Charles F. Golden, The Methodist Church.

The Rev. Dr. Benjamin F. Payton, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA (Coordinator of National Committee).

THE POWELL AFFAIR—A CRISIS OF MORALS AND FAITH

The manner in which Adam Powell was stripped of his chairmanship and refused his seat in Congress and the way the real issues in the case have been distorted, throw into bold relief the crisis at the heart of race relations in America. The action of Congress, in its precipitousness and harshness, is symptomatic and symbolic of the continuing and perhaps growing alienation between Negro and white Americans. The vigorous defense of Powell even by Negroes who frequently disagree with him, and the outpouring of verbal abuse by many white Americans who seem to reject him totally, suggest that the crisis may rapidly worsen unless some genuinely healing acts are performed quickly.

We, an informal group of Negro churchmen, are of the conviction that the resources of the Christian faith are relevant to both understanding the real nature of this crisis and to resolving it with justice. To that end, we wish to make the following observations.

First, we note that the leaders of the civil rights movement have not focused upon the spurious issue of Congressman Powell's personal conduct. We believe these Negro leaders have rightly seen that the real issue lies elsewhere. It simply is not possible for Congress to be *honestly* concerned about the personal conduct of *one* of its members without manifesting any real concern for developing a code of ethics by which *all* of its members can be judged. We wish to be absolutely clear on this point. Our argument is not that Powell or any other congressman should *not* be punished if involved in malfeasance. Our concern is that Congress needs an impartial moral code to determine precisely the nature of a malfeasance and the kind of punishment justified. We do *not* argue that Powell did no wrong, nor do we conclude that he should not be punished, *if found guilty by impartial rules and appropriate agencies*. We do argue that in the absence of a set of objective guidelines and given the peculiar circumstances of Powell's race and reputation, Congress was bound to respond arbitrarily and unjustly to his case.

Two examples should make this quite clear. How did Congress decide in 1956 to seat Rep. Thomas Lane of Massachusetts and to leave his seniority untouched, even though he had been convicted and jailed for income tax evasion? Why is it that Senator Dodd from Connecticut has not been asked to stand aside from his seat or have his seniority challenged, while he is investigated on charges of diverting hundreds of thousands of dollars of campaign funds to his personal use?

The fact that Congressman-elect Powell was unseated *prior* to the investigation of the Select Committee appointed to examine the charges against him, is already a pre-judgment of the case against him. This is

radically different from the way in which Congress handled Representative Lane or Senator Dodd. It is this discrepancy and arbitrariness which we protest. An impartial order of law is essential if the human spirit is to find its way to an order of freedom and justice which God wills for man's life on earth.

Moreover, as the lawyers of the American Civil Liberties Union argue in a *brief amici* to the Select Committee investigating Powell's status in the Congress, the Congress acted unconstitutionally in demanding that Powell stand aside from his seat. Congress only has the right to judge a person elected to Congress in terms of the three requirements that he be (1) no less than 25 years old; (2) a citizen of the United States no less than seven years, and (3) an inhabitant of the state in which he was elected at the time of the election. On the basis of this argument, Powell's troubles in the courts of New York are quite irrelevant to the matter of whether or not he should be seated, even as it was deemed irrelevant in the case of Representative Lane of Massachusetts.

There is also considerable evidence that in taking away from Powell the chairmanship of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the Democratic caucus might have been responding more to the desire of some white forces within labor circles to establish a separate committee on labor than to a concern for Powell's alleged misuse of his powers as chairman of that committee. It is a well-known fact that Powell slowed down some labor legislation in an effort to pressure some unions to end racial discrimination. From our point of view, the important moral issue is the opportunistic use of congressional power in the climate of a resurgent white racism to destroy an important symbol of the Negroes' reach for power in one of the key committees of the House.

This arbitrary and cynical use of power by white men over black men is the essential political meaning of racism. The fact that many "friends of the Negro" were involved in the act does not change its essential meaning. There are indications that this arbitrary act has fed the fires of racism, has given fresh courage to self-conscious bigots and new life to old political coalitions designed explicitly to oppress Negro American citizens. This should be a matter of concern to all Americans, but certainly to all Christians who work for a society of impartial law and true morality.

Our protest, we insist, is not *only* in behalf of Mr. Powell but in behalf of the vision of a just social and political order which Christians share with all men of goodwill. It is a narrow moral perspective indeed which argues that Powell's deportment (not at all unique in the halls of government) is of such crucial importance to the achievement of that vision that he should be punished in such a way as to cancel out a much more fundamental moral concern. That concern is the possibility of *participating with power* in our society which the strategic position of a chairmanship of a key committee makes possible for both the white and black poor of this nation. It has taken many decades for a Negro with a constituency of strength behind him to achieve the position of chairman of such a key committee as the one in question. Many white Americans hypocritically ask if Negroes would be as concerned had a white congressman been treated in the manner in which Powell was handled. This merely shows the inability of groups with inordinate power either to understand or to appreciate the need for groups who are powerless to be concerned not just with single individuals, white or black, but with the social basis for gaining and wielding power.

We speak, therefore, in behalf of a much

more basic and profound moral issue in America today than Powell's personal plety. That issue is the legitimate and necessary power of a racial minority to participate fully and effectively in political and economic decisions that affect the destiny of us all. That the Negro who has been the object of generations of social injustice and racial prejudice should be divested arbitrarily of an important symbol of this power because of the alleged imprudent behavior of the person who occupies the seat of that power, is a morally indefensible argument. Our situation in this nation, tottering as it does on the brink of social upheaval in festering black ghettos across the land, is much too critical to permit that *kind* of moral judgment to blunt our sense of reality and paralyze our keenest sensibilities.

The second observation is, we believe, even more important. The discrepancies involved in the treatment of Powell reveal a crisis in a realm deeper than that of law and morality. The concern of many white Americans that Powell is not a "model Negro" reveals that many white people expect from Negroes conduct so different from that expected of white men that it discloses what can only be called a crisis of faith. When Americans show such little faith in the real humanity of Negroes, they are at the same time exhibiting little confidence in their own humanity. To be a man means to have frailties as well as strengths. The tragic truth is that few white Americans are able to view Negroes other than as a contrast to themselves. American politics and culture stereotype Negro leaders either as paragons of virtue or as totally depraved. This is a crisis in the realm of faith. It is a denial of the right to be a person to a creature of God and is thus a rejection of Him who created all men in His image.

The crisis of faith implicit in the response of many Americans to Adam Powell is also revealed by the manner in which many well-meaning Americans equate conventional respectability with the righteousness of God. This is one of the more damaging distortions of Christian faith which produces many idolatries in American culture. It involves both the avid worship of middle-class styles of morality and the total rejection of persons and beliefs which appear to be different. We would hope that *all Americans*, black and white, would view personal and social maturity in terms which capture more of the complexity of human nature and society than has thus far been exhibited in the Powell incident.

We certainly will not be intimidated by bigots who pretend to be distressed about Powell's "honor as a clergyman" and Negro "reverse-racism" while they do everything in their power to thwart justice for the Negroes. This nation's easy acceptance of segregationists as chairmen of the most powerful committees in Congress is abhorrent not merely because they defy the Constitution but because they worship the idol god of Race. In the process, they bring all of the evil consequences of that faithlessness upon our land. When white Americans express shocked indignation at Powell's affront to their conventional pieties but install racial bigotry in the nation's seats of power, that is not just a crisis of morality; that is a crisis of faith.

Our third observation is that the Powell who has been presented in the press is a caricature of the Powell to whom white churches and synagogues, labor unions and educational institutions, as well as Negro Americans, owe an unparalleled debt for an unexcelled legislative record in the House. As chairman of the Labor and Education Committee, it was Powell who steered through the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Anti-Poverty Bill, the Juvenile Delinquency Act, the Vocational Education Act and the National Defense Education Act.

These bills have benefited all Americans, not just Powell's Harlem constituency.

Certainly Negro Americans cannot forget that Powell is disliked by many white Americans not only because of allegations regarding his personal conduct, but because it was Powell who desegregated congressional facilities for his staff and himself when he first came to Congress in 1945; because it was Powell who attached the "Powell Amendment," a desegregation rider to school, housing, and labor bills which Congress was considering passing and which did not outlaw discrimination. It was Powell who forced congressional recognition of discrimination in the Daughters of the American Revolution. It was Powell who brought to a vote the question of segregation in the nation's capital. It was Powell who demanded that Negro journalists also be seated in the Senate and House press galleries. It was Powell who introduced a bill prohibiting segregation in the armed forces. It was this same man of whom President Lyndon B. Johnson said in observance of his fifth anniversary as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee:

"The Fifth Anniversary of your chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee . . . represents the successful reporting to the Congress of 49 pieces of bedrock legislation. . . . The passage of every one of these bills attests to your ability to get things done. . . . Only with progressive leadership could so much have been accomplished by one committee in so short a time. I speak for the millions of Americans who benefit from these laws when I say that I am truly grateful."

Finally, it should be apparent that America stands in great peril today. No one can predict what anguish the year 1967 will bring in relations between black and white, separated by gross differences of wealth, status, and by the white noose of suburbia around every metropolitan area. We cannot afford to permit the Powell affair to be used as a political stratagem and a racist ploy to further exacerbate the difficulties we are now experiencing in the great cities of the nation.

We, therefore, call upon the Congress of the United States and the Democratic caucus to permit Mr. Powell to return to his seat as the Representative of the 18th Congressional District of New York and to the chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee. If, in the future, an impartial code of ethics is developed for judging the behavior of all congressmen, we would expect that Congressman Powell and all other congressmen would be held accountable to those guidelines. The actions taken against Mr. Powell in the absence of such guidelines have been arbitrary, cynical, and imply racial bias when compared with acts against other congressmen.

As Negro churchmen committed to a greater involvement of the church in the struggle for racial justice, we further call upon our white brothers, especially those of the clergy, who have a prophetic sense of justice, to join us now in exposing the crisis of faith which underlies the surface issues of this incident. We urge them to share with us in a ministry of healing to help America face the truth about herself and to turn her from the idolatrous worship of white skin to the worship of the true God.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULDER] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 90th Congress, I reintroduced my resolution, House Resolution 78, calling on the House of Representatives to take a stand against the Soviet Union's treatment of its nationals who happen to be of the Jewish faith.

While there have been hopeful signs from the Soviet Union on the possible reunification of Russian Jews with their families living outside the Soviet Union, it is extremely important that we not forget those of the 3 million Russian Jews who cannot take advantage of the opportunity to leave, if such an opportunity does, in fact, come about. The Soviet Union has a long history of permitting the private Soviet citizen to engage in anti-Semitic activities and worst of all has itself engaged in such conduct.

In addition to the prohibitions and restraints placed upon religious education, religious publishing, freedom of worship, and the freedom to observe properly religious holidays, the Government of the Soviet Union has deliberately perpetrated the falsehood that its Jewish citizens are responsible for many of its economic problems and have been guilty of so-called economic crimes. It has on numerous occasions tried and executed Jews for these alleged economic crimes.

The pattern of discrimination and persecution is quite clear for all to see and I believe that the House of Representatives should, at this time, place itself on record in favor of freedom of religion and in opposition to persecution of Soviet Jews. I strongly urge our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, to schedule hearings on this resolution at the earliest opportunity.

ADULT HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBER] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce today a bill to be cited as the Adult Health Protection Act of 1967. This bill is designed to protect the health of adult citizens, who have attained age 50, by establishing a program for the detection of disease through regional and community health centers.

As we all know, the distinguished Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, of the neighboring State of New Jersey, has led the fight for such health detection centers. It is a personal privilege to join the able Senator and his colleagues in pursuit of this needed legislation.

The goal of detecting disease before it has grown into a major affliction of incurable proportion, is indeed an enlightened approach. We have only to look at the medicare program to see the wisdom of this proposal. The great needs and

demands for medicare, among the elderly, draw our attention to the reality that reducing illness and the resulting cost of treatment is necessary.

Some 87 million persons in the United States now suffer from at least one chronic condition. More than seven out of 10 persons of age 45 or over are so afflicted. It simply makes commonsense to place greater emphasis on prevention of disease so that we do not have to pay out money for hospital care of illnesses which might have been caught in time.

The economics of such prevention is plain to see. It is estimated that chronic disease takes a dollar toll of about \$58 billion a year in direct and indirect cost.

I believe we have a social responsibility to the citizens of this great Nation, who suffer the most in both physical damage and economic loss, to offer a sound national program of detection.

I believe my colleagues in the House will find this bill worthy of their urgent consideration.

NATIONAL MASTER GROUND TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution—House Joint Resolution 427—which would call for the development of a national master ground transportation plan. This would authorize the Department of Transportation and the Interstate Commerce Commission to develop a national plan and policy with regard to ground transportation. Within a year, the two agencies would submit their plan to the Congress for legislative consideration. During the year in which the plan is being drafted, a moratorium would be declared on railroad merger and train discontinuances.

It is about time that we develop a long-range policy regarding ground transportation rather than continuing to improvise. Right now mergers are considered on a case-by-case basis. What is approved in the East may not necessarily be approved in the West. As a result, there is court litigation and a good deal of uncertainty within the industry. Capital investment programs are delayed, and the goal of an efficient and coordinated rail system is farther off than ever.

Our lack of planning and policy with regard to ground transportation is further illustrated by the plight of our passenger rail facilities. No other modern country in the world has let its passenger rail service deteriorate as we have in the United States in the last two decades. Train after train is allowed to be discontinued. ICC procedures do not require any real analysis of the effect of these discontinuances. As William H. Tucker, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission stated last year:

While we know that hundreds of passenger trains have stopped running since 1958, and

we can measure by total statistics the declining use of passenger service, as a whole, there is no realistic method available to tell us exactly where we now stand in terms of realistic needs, prospects, and potential of intercity railway passenger service. Present Section 13a provisions seem to channel the railroads to a sporadic usage of its procedures. The tendency in the usual case is to remove particular trains whenever the cost and revenue data seem propitious, with no well-conceived plan to account for the consequences on such things as feeder revenues, remaining through connecting train operations, or the remaining market requirements in the area affected.

Chairman Tucker feels that—

The scope and quality of future railway passenger service represent at least as important a national domestic issue as any other this country will face in the next decade.

I agree that this is, indeed, an important issue and one that such limited programs as the High-Speed Ground Transportation Program will not solve. We need to declare an immediate moratorium on discontinuing passenger service while we formulate a policy in keeping with our present and future rail passenger requirements.

Another policy issue that requires careful consideration is the relationship of rail transportation to other modes of transportation. Present restrictions on common ownership may be inhibiting the true coordination of our transportation system.

Mr. Speaker, the function of our new Department of Transportation is to provide this country with an efficient and coordinated transportation system in keeping with the complex requirements of our economy. I strongly urge that one of its first tasks be the development of a comprehensive ground transportation plan as provided in the legislation which I am introducing today.

The text of House Joint Resolution 427 follows:

H.J. RES. 427

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Transportation acting in cooperation with the Interstate Commerce Commission shall, within one year after the date of enactment of this Joint Resolution, prepare and submit to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives a master ground transportation plan for the United States.

SEC. 2. Until the 60th day after the submission of the master ground transportation plan to the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives as provided by the first section of this Joint Resolution, the Interstate Commerce Commission may not approve any consolidation, unification, merger, or acquisition of control of a railroad corporation, nor may there be any discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, of the operation or service of any train or ferry subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, unless such discontinuance or change is approved by the appropriate State regulatory agency of each State affected by such discontinuance or change. During the period while the Interstate Commerce Commission may not approve any consolidation, unification, merger, or acquisition of control of a railroad corporation, the operation of any provisions of antitrust laws applicable to mergers or consolidations that are not opera-

tive while the Commission has such authority shall be in full force and have full effect.

A BILL TO IMPROVE THE DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 7107, a bill to provide for better direction and supervision of the Central Intelligence Agency and other U.S. intelligence activities.

The bill would place the political action activities of the CIA under the President's personal direction. It would also establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence to supervise CIA activities. The membership of the committee would be changed every 4 years in order to bring fresh insights to bear on CIA operations.

I am distressed by recent revelations of the extent of the Central Intelligence Agency's secret involvement in American civilian life. Americans have discovered that the hand of the CIA has been laid on student organizations, universities, labor unions, and the press. How much further the CIA has woven itself into the fabric of American life no one on the outside knows. The Washington Post recently reported that only about \$15 million of CIA largesse has been traced and that "unsubstantiated rumors" place the actual amounts in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

On February 16, I said in a speech here on the floor that if the valuable work of the National Student Association, the Peace Corps, and other private American groups is not to be destroyed by suspected ties to the CIA, we must initiate an immediate housecleaning.

If there is to be tidying up, it falls upon Congress to do it. I sincerely hope that we will get on with the task.

The first job is to be clear as to what we are about.

The CIA is in a sense a front for itself. Its publicly announced function is to gather intelligence; but, in addition, it has the covert assignment of carrying out political action in furtherance of U.S. foreign policy.

Allen Dulles, whose excellent book "The Craft of Intelligence," is the most straightforward statement on the CIA which I have seen, puts it this way:

CIA is not an underground operation. All one needs to do is to read the law—the National Security Act of 1947—to get a general idea of what it is set up to do. It has, of course, a secret side, and the law permits the National Security Council, which in effect means the President, to assign to the CIA certain duties and functions in the intelligence field in addition to those specifically enumerated in the law. These functions are not disclosed.

The cloak of intelligence shields the dagger of political action.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Subsection 102(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 lists as the intelligence duties of the CIA:

(1) to advise the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security;

(2) to make recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;

(3) to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government using where appropriate existing agencies and facilities;

(4) to perform for the benefit of existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally;

Intelligence is not defined in the statute. A widely accepted definition found in the Dictionary of U.S. Military Terms for Joint Usage describes intelligence as: "The product resulting from the collection, evaluation, analysis, integration, and interpretation of all available information which concerns one or more aspects of foreign nations or of areas of operations, and which is immediately or potentially significant to planning."

Simply put, intelligence is information culled from numerous sources. There is a common misconception that intelligence work is wholly espionage—the secret gathering of information by agents or mechanical devices, such as the U-2. In fact, about 80 percent of all peacetime intelligence comes from open sources—from reports of State Department officials, military attachés, or tourists, or from a careful reading of newspapers, periodicals, and other published documents.

Most of us would agree, I am sure, with the 1955 task force on intelligence activities of the Hoover Commission that—

The fate of the Nation well may rest on accurate and complete intelligence data which may serve as a trustworthy guide for the top-level governmental decisions on policy and action in a troubled world.

In the present anarchic world of independent nation states, great powers must continue to gather information by straight forward and by devious means about the military capabilities and intentions of rival nations.

The 1962 Cuban missile crisis is an object lesson. Only our highly developed intelligence system, including our aerial surveillance of Cuba, gave us the opportunity to avert the installation of offensive Russian missiles 90 miles off our shores.

Intelligence activities, though distasteful when espionage work is involved, must be viewed as a necessary evil.

SPECIAL OPERATIONS

The dark side of the CIA is its special operations in political action. Paragraph 102(d) (5) of the National Security Act authorizes the CIA:

(5) to perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

Many rumors exist as to what in the past two decades have been CIA special operations. CIA's most notable effort was, of course, the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion. Also on the public record are two CIA-engineered palace coups—one in 1953, in Iran against Mossadegh, and the other in 1954, in Guatemala against Arbenz.

The recently revealed CIA subsidies to all kinds of private groups are another form of special operations. The principal purpose of giving financial assistance to the National Student Association was to prevent the other side from capturing world youth conferences, not to gather intelligence.

Allen Dulles has been quite forthright about CIA's political action activities. He writes that it is the task of the CIA to assist the internal security services of countries which are the targets of Communist takeovers wherever this can best be done on a covert basis.

Mr. Dulles justifies covert special operations as a necessary weapon against Communist subversion. Perhaps this too is a necessary evil. But, if it is sometimes justified to carry on covert special operations, it must be done sparingly and with the greatest selectivity and sensitivity. For it is a weapon with vast implications for deepening United States involvement, as President Kennedy rightly foresaw at the Bay of Pigs. It is also a weapon which should be used only where the stakes are high. Secret U.S. Government meddling in the affairs of state of other nations or in the affairs of domestic or foreign private organizations is so alien to our traditions that it can only be justified when the national security is genuinely at stake.

A large part of the difficulty of justifying the recently revealed CIA subsidies to private organizations is the very real doubt whether the efforts of these groups, no matter how laudable, are really vital to our national security.

A CRITICAL DISTINCTION

To properly direct and supervise the CIA, foreign intelligence activities must be carefully distinguished from special operations.

The two activities differ in kind. Intelligence work produces neutral information as an aid to the President in reaching decisions involving the national security. But in its political action activities, the CIA is an arm of already established policy.

The two activities differ in seriousness. Intelligence activities, even espionage activities, very seldom, if ever, have the potential for more deeply involving the United States. There is evidence that even the U-2 incident, which was an intelligence activity, was seized upon by Khrushchev as a pretext for torpedoing the Paris Summit Conference, and not the basic cause for its failure.

On the other hand, secret political warfare which threatens other governments could become a casus belli; and less ambitious activities, such as the National Student Association affair, have wider philosophical and ethical aspects which must be carefully weighed.

The two activities differ in sensitivity. Espionage is, both at home and abroad,

an accepted international activity; subversion is not. If the United States is not to remake itself in the mirror image of its adversaries, it must use the latter instrument, if at all, with the greatest discretion.

Mr. Dulles confirms that foreign intelligence activities and special operations can be separated. Traditionally, he says, intelligence services have kept espionage and political and psychological warfare in different compartments, but—

The CIA abandoned this kind of compartmentalization which so often leads to neither the right hand nor the left knowing what the other is doing.

WEAKNESSES IN PRESENT CIA DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION

There are two major weaknesses in today's administrative setup for directing and supervising the CIA:

First. The special operations of the CIA are not necessarily under the personal direction of the President.

Second. The people who supervise the CIA are not changed often enough to bring a fresh viewpoint to bear on CIA activities.

1. PRESIDENTIAL DIRECTION

Subsection 102 of the National Security Act places all activities of the CIA under the general direction of the National Security Council. In addition, the CIA can only undertake special operations which the National Security Council from time to time directs.

The National Security Council, whose sole function is to advise the President, as a body does not make decisions. It therefore cannot itself direct the CIA. So far as I can determine from published sources (for this is not a part of the official information on the CIA), the National Security Council has delegated the direction of the CIA to a high level interdepartmental committee, sometimes known as the Special Group.

This committee is composed of a high-ranking member of the White House staff, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs. The committee meets weekly.

Mr. Dulles says:

All operations of intelligence character which involve policy considerations are subject to [the committee's] approval.

Ultimately, the CIA is under the control of the President; and I assume that the interdepartmental committee refers questions which it believes to be of great importance to the President.

It is clear that the CIA is subject today to higher political authority; namely, the directives of the interdepartmental committee, the policies of the National Security Council, and, ultimately, the direction of the President.

For example, in the case of the National Student Association subsidy, the recently appointed Katzenbach committee has reported:

When the Central Intelligence Agency lent financial support to the work of certain American private organizations, it did not act on its own initiative but in accordance with national policies established by the National Security Council in 1952 through 1954. Throughout it acted with the approval of

senior interdepartmental review committees, including the Secretaries of State and Defense or their representatives. These policies have, therefore, been in effect under four Presidents.

This direction is not good enough, however, when questions concerning CIA special operations are up for discussion. These operations are so serious and so sensitive that the President personally should authorize each and every one in writing, and should periodically review each of them.

I have therefore included in my bill a provision requiring a Presidential directive to authorize each special operation, and an annual Presidential review of the operation. This amendment will underline the extreme seriousness of special operations and the extraordinary importance of their being limited in number and nature, precisely directed, and carefully supervised.

In addition, I have designated the President as the person to give general direction to the intelligence activities of the CIA, since the National Security Council is only an advisory body. This change is a technical one which will probably not alter present White House supervisory arrangements.

2. PERIODIC CHANGES OF CIA CONGRESSIONAL SUPERVISION

In the National Student Association case, it is clear that the top Presidential aides charged with national security duties, appropriate cabinet officers or their representatives, and the Congressmen and Senators who serve on CIA watchdog committees all knew of this CIA activity and approved of it. It is unclear whether members of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board knew of it, but it is probably fair to assume that they did. They should have, if they were doing their job properly.

I can only conclude that the CIA policymakers were mistaken because, being insiders for so long, their perspective had become distorted. The keen edge of commonsense had been dulled by lengthy contact with the intelligence and military communities.

The need for men of clear insight to pass on intelligence matters can only be supplied by periodic changes of CIA supervisors.

My bill establishes a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence. The joint committee's job would be to examine continuously the foreign intelligence activities and the special operations of the CIA. The joint committee would be reconstituted with new members every 4 years, at the beginning of even-numbered Congresses. In this way Congress can periodically take a fresh look at the CIA.

No criticism is meant of the Members of Congress who now devote themselves to oversight of CIA matters and appropriations. There has been a job under difficult circumstances. But the present system of Congressional oversight is too piecemeal to produce the close supervision which is called for.

THE JUDGMENT OF HISTORY

Secrecy is essential in the tasks of the CIA—whether intelligence gathering or

political actions. Yet this same secrecy is the chief problem in assuring that CIA actions are in keeping with American values.

But, as President Kennedy suggested when speaking to CIA personnel on November 28, 1961, it is "in the long sweep of history" that the efforts of the CIA will be judged. By this judgment of history the American public retains a subtle control.

To assure that the full record is available to the historians, the bill provides that no CIA records can be destroyed without the approval of the Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence.

All Government agencies, including the CIA, are now subject to the statutory requirement that the Joint Congressional Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers approve any record destruction. With this immense task before it, understandably, the joint committee cannot give much attention to any single request for permission to destroy records. And in the case of the CIA, even if the Joint Congressional Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers were to pursue a request to destroy records, it would have a difficult time ascertaining the importance of the records, since it is not privy to CIA operations.

Thus, it is logical to transfer the function of passing on CIA requests to destroy records to the Joint Committee on Intelligence, which would have the time, resources, and authority to make certain that all important CIA records are preserved for future historians.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to give serious consideration to this bill.

Its sum and substance is to strengthen the control of the Nation's elected representatives—both the President and Congress—over the CIA. Its enactment would not hamper the effectiveness of the CIA. It would only help to insure that this potent secret arm of our foreign policy is directed by American values and not by the values of our adversaries.

A copy of H.R. 7107 follows:

H.R. 7107

A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 and the Records Disposal Act of July 7, 1943, to provide for the improved direction and supervision by the President and by the Congress of the foreign intelligence activities and special operations of the United States

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

IMPROVEMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL DIRECTION

SECTION 1. (a) Subsection (d) of section 102 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the President—

"(1) to advise the President in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security;

"(2) to make recommendations to the President for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;

"(3) to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide

for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government using where appropriate existing agencies and facilities: *Provided*, That the Agency shall have no police, subpoena, law-enforcement powers, or internal-security functions: *Provided further*, That the departments and other agencies of the Government shall continue to collect, evaluate, correlate, and disseminate departmental intelligence: *And provided further*, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure;

"(4) to perform for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional intelligence activities as the President determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally and directs in writing;

"(5) to perform such special operations affecting the national security and to expend such funds thereon as the President may from time to time direct in writing."

(b) Section 102 is further amended by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (d) the following subsection:

"(e) (1) Within sixty days of the enactment of this amendment, the Director of Central Intelligence, and the heads of other executive departments and agencies having responsibilities for special operations shall report in writing to the President on each special operation in which the department or agency is then engaged. Each report shall include a comprehensive description of the special operation, its history, its objectives, the number of persons engaged in the operation, the total annual expenditures planned for the operation, and the total expenditures made to date. The President shall review each report and shall issue a written directive stating whether the special operation shall be continued or terminated, and, if continued, at what level of effort and expenditure it shall be continued.

"(2) Thereafter, at least once a year from the date of the Presidential directive establishing the operation (or, in the case of an operation under way on the date of enactment, annually from the date of the Presidential directive issued in accordance with paragraph (1) hereof), the head of the department or agency engaged in the special operation shall report in writing to the President on the current status of the operation. This annual report shall include a comprehensive description of the special operation, its history, its objectives, the number of persons engaged in the operation, the total annual expenditures planned for the operation, and the total expenditures made to date."

IMPROVEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL SUPERVISION BY ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

SEC. 2. Section 102 is amended by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

"(h) (1) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on Intelligence to be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than four Members shall be members of the same political party.

"(2) The entire joint committee shall be reappointed on January 3, 1971, and every four years thereafter. No Member shall serve more than four successive years as a member of the joint committee, except that a Member originally appointed to fill a vacancy may serve the uncompleted term and four years thereafter.

"(3) The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the foreign intelligence activities and special operations of the United States, and problems relating thereto, including problems of the gathering of

intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government, and the advisability and problems of carrying out special operations. The Central Intelligence Agency and other departments and agencies engaged in foreign intelligence activities and special operations shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to their activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence Agency and to activities of other departments and agencies engaged in foreign intelligence activities shall be referred to the joint committee (including lists and schedules of records lacking preservation value submitted to Congress by the Administrator of General Services pursuant to Section 4 of the Act of July 7, 1943 (44 U.S.C. 369)). The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, their recommendations, by bill or otherwise, with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

"(4) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

"(5) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

"(6) The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government on a reimbursable basis with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned.

"(7) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed \$250,000 per year, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. Section 102 is further amended by inserting after the new subsection (h) the following new subsection:

"(i) As used in this section:

"(1) 'Intelligence' means knowledge which is the product resulting from the collection, evaluation, analysis, integration, and interpretation of all available information which concerns one or more aspects of foreign nations or of areas of operations and which is immediately or potentially significant to policymaking or planning.

"(2) 'Intelligence activities' means those activities undertaken for the sole purpose of producing intelligence, and does not mean covert operations which, in whole or in part, are undertaken to carry out the foreign policy of the United States.

"(3) 'Special operations' means those covert operations undertaken by the Central Intelligence Agency or other departments or agencies which, in whole or in part, are undertaken to carry out the foreign policy of the United States."

PRESERVATION OF INTELLIGENCE RECORDS

SEC. 4. (a) Section 5 of the Act of July 7, 1943 (44 U.S.C. 370) is amended by adding an additional sentence at the end thereof as follows:

"Except that all lists or schedules of the records of the Central Intelligence Agency, or of the activities of any other departments or agencies engaged in foreign intelligence activities and special operations, shall be referred to the Joint Committee on Intelligence, and the joint committee shall examine such lists or schedules and submit to the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, a report of such examination and its recommendations."

(b) Section 6 of the Act of July 7, 1943 (44 U.S.C. 371) is amended by inserting, after the words "joint committee" and before the word "reports", the phrase, "to which the lists or schedules were referred".

(c) Section 7 of the Act of July 7, 1943 (44 U.S.C. 372) is amended by inserting, after the words "joint committee" and before the word "falls", the phrase, "to which the lists or schedules were referred".

VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL SCHOOLS IN FLORIDA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that my State of Florida has had an excellent record in moving forward strongly in the development of the building of some 29 area vocational and technical schools and in an overall expansion of its vocational program in the State.

Florida has been one of the fastest growing States in the country and has expanded greatly its vocational schools and has presently five more schools in the planning stages. It is, therefore, apparent that we must appropriate the full authorized figure for fiscal 1968 as authorized under Public Law 88-210. To point out this great need I would like to at this point of the Record insert a letter from Floyd T. Christian, superintendent of public instruction for the State of Florida, and Carl W. Proehl, assistant superintendent for vocational, technical, and adult education, concerning the need to adequately fund this program. Also I would like to call to my colleagues' attention and insert in the Record for their further reading a résumé of program activities by the State of Florida in this area of education.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to read this letter and résumé with great interest and urge the House Appropriations Committee to adequately and sufficiently fund this program for this fiscal year.

The material referred to follows:

STATE OF FLORIDA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Tallahassee, Fla., March 1, 1967.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: We would like to take this opportunity to express our continued appreciation for all of the legislation

which has assisted in strengthening Vocational, Technical and Adult Education programs throughout the State of Florida. Florida has profited particularly through the continuation of the Smith-Hughes appropriations, the full appropriation of the George-Barden funds, and immeasurably through the Vocational Education Act of 1963. By virtue of the latter act, Florida has moved forward strongly in the development and building of some 29 Area Vocational-Technical School, and in an overall expansion of its vocational programs from Pensacola to Key West.

Florida now has an excellent beginning to do what it must for its people and the economy, but we must continue our efforts and complete all 29 area vocational schools and the five others in the planning stage. Additional programs must be provided in comprehensive high schools, junior colleges, as well as in the sparsely populated regions of our state which can support only small individual programs.

To accomplish all of this will require a tremendous effort and continued financial support through state and federal legislation. We would, therefore, respectfully request your support of those particular areas which are crucial to the further development of our vocational, technical and adult education programs. This would involve appropriating for fiscal 1968 the full amount of funds authorized by PL 88-210 and other Acts which authorize funds for vocational education. There must be continued emphasis on research and evaluation, so that a more accurate assessment can be made of what has and what needs to be done, and the directions which must be taken. We are concerned that an expanded appropriation in the Work Study Program be made in order to help those who could not otherwise profit from an educational program. The Teacher Education Program, as well, is of great concern to us. It is hoped that more adequate support may be received to help prepare the kinds of teachers Florida needs and in the quantity required.

All of these areas—occupational training programs, research, evaluation, work study efforts, and teacher education—are well under way in Florida and can offer direct evidence of a sound investment of federal monies. Now these programs must be continued and expanded, and additional new programs must be built. This cannot be done without continued full appropriations under PL 88-210 and other federal legislation.

Enclosed is a resume of program activities and contributions carried out under federal and state appropriations here in Florida as an indication of the sound investment which we are making with federal funds. It would be helpful, in the interest of further support for Vocational Education, if this resume could be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Your assistance in this matter would be greatly appreciated.

Your continued support of the educational program in Florida is sincerely appreciated, and we hope that you will help vocational education provide even better programs for all who can profit from it.

Sincerely,

FLOYD T. CHRISTIAN,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

CARL W. PROEHL,
Assistant Superintendent, Vocational,
Technical, and Adult Education.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN FLORIDA

To: The Congressional Delegation from Florida.

From: State Department of Education, Division of Vocation, Technical, and Adult Education, Tallahassee, Fla., March 1, 1967.

For many years, Florida has offered a variety of vocational education programs for youth and adults. Now, in February, 1967,

at the time of the 50th Anniversary of the signing of the first National Vocational Education Act, it is appropriate that thought be given to the progress which has been made and to planning for future service. What has happened in the past 50 years is only a prelude to great new developments in vocational education in the future.

Vocational education in Florida has grown from humble beginnings in this century to become one of the state's most potent forces for educational, economic, and social development. Vocational education includes programs in agriculture, home economics, industrial education, business education, and technical and health related occupations education. Work is offered to prepare youth and adults for employment, and supplemental training is offered to retrain or upgrade people who are already employed. Of nearly 300,000 persons enrolled in vocational courses in 1966, approximately 60% were high school graduates and adults seeking job preparation or supplemental training. The others were high school students.

In addition to vocational education, related education, which is closely allied to job training in that it provides exploratory experiences prior to specialization, is offered to many thousands of persons in Florida. Related education includes high school programs of industrial arts, general business, and general home economics as well as general adult education. Enrollments in vocational and related education have grown from 355,000 in 1955 to almost 750,000 in 1966 and are expected to exceed 1,000,000 by 1975.

Vocational education in Florida has been given great impetus through the recent plans for a state-wide system of area vocational-technical schools which will place a training center within reach—financially and geographically—of nearly all the residents of the state. The area schools will expand vocational training by offering many different courses and by emphasizing quality, quantity, and variety in every aspect of each program. Courses will insure a complete program for all students including youth and adults. In addition, the area schools will help many high schools become more comprehensive by providing broadened opportunities for secondary students to enroll in vocational courses.

Financial support to build area vocational schools has come primarily from state and local sources, but has been supplemented with federal funds. Currently, 29 area schools have been designated and approved for construction by the State Board for Vocational Education. These are in various stages of construction. Schools have been approved for the following counties or multi-county areas: Bay, Bradford-Union, Brevard, Broward, Citrus-Hernando, Columbia-Baker-Gilchrist, Dade, Escambia, Hillsborough, Jackson-Calhoun, Lake, Lee, Leon, Madison-Jefferson-Lafayette, Manatee, Marion, Monroe, Okaloosa-Walton, Orange, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Sarasota, Seminole, Suwannee-Hamilton, Taylor-Dixie, Volusia, Washington-Holmes, St. Lucie.

Nine of the area vocational schools approved by the State Board of Education will be divisions of community junior colleges; the others will be separate and independent vocational-technical centers. Some will be entirely new, while others are already existing schools which will be greatly expanded. Sixteen of the new facilities are scheduled to be completed by the fall of 1967, and five additional schools are expected to open in the spring of 1968. The remaining approved facilities are scheduled for later completion.

These new facilities will provide shops, laboratories, and classrooms for a wide variety of vocational programs including auto repair, agriculture, advertising, hotel work, typing, dental assisting, medical assisting, home economics for gainful employment, cooking, and numerous technologies.

Schools already open and schools scheduled to open later this year will serve Florida counties with a combined population of over 2½ million persons, or approximately 39% of the total population of the state. Additional schools, already approved, will serve counties with another 2¼ million persons. Thus, all schools approved will serve a population of over 4½ million persons or approximately 83% of the population of the state. In addition to schools already approved, five or six additional sites are being studied, providing, ultimately, almost complete coverage of the state.

Financial support of vocational education in Florida has been a joint local-state-federal undertaking, the major portion of funds coming from local and state sources. In a recent year, 83% of funds for vocational programs was from local and state sources and 17% was from the federal government. Increased financial support will be needed as facilities and personnel increase. Teachers employed in 1966 totaled 3690 and it has been estimated that 6670 will be needed in 1969.

The vast expansion projected for vocational education is expected to result not only from additional facilities, additional programs, additional teachers, and the like, but also because of Florida's present industrial growth. Vocational education helps counties of Florida exploit their resources more fully; it strengthens their economy; it helps enrich the lives of their people; and the monetary and intrinsic rewards have emphasis and meaning for the people themselves. Through vocational education and employment, people realize their importance as human beings and as participants in and contributors to our society.

As new area schools have been approved, special studies have been made to prescribe new and additional vocational-technical programs. These programs have been based on students' interests, employment opportunities, and on economic and social needs of people as determined in surveys and by other means. Programs have been designed for particular areas where schools are to be expanded or new schools added. Thus, programs to train waiters and waitresses may be appropriate for one area whereas electronics technology may be appropriate for another.

Jobs for students who complete vocational and technical education courses are a major concern of the Division. Studies are underway, with participants from over the state, to determine how the placement of students may be made more effective. Each county in Florida has reported past activities for placement and follow-up and plans for improvement. Thus, the Division is concerned with every facet of vocational education including adequate counseling and guidance prior and during preparatory training and also with graduates' work performance and job satisfaction.

Vocational education develops the spirit of initiative and enterprise in trainees. It provides a well-trained work force which attracts industry. It reduces unemployment. It prepares individuals for initial entrance into and advancement within an occupation or occupational cluster. It not only prepares for employment but includes supplemental training or retraining as well. Educators are alert to changes brought on by automation and by changing technologies so that new training programs can be provided.

Florida has grown mightily as new industries have moved to the state and educators have been alert to the need for trained technicians. In 1965 it was reported that 65% of the dropouts and 40% of the high school graduates, across the nation, had had no work experience during their school years. Nine dropouts out of every ten reported no job training after leaving school. It has been and will continue to be a concern of vocational educators to provide occupational education at all instructional levels,

for all classes of people and, where necessary, to offer special programs for special classes of people.

The needs of disadvantaged persons is a concern of educators throughout the state. Relatively few people choose unemployment as a way of life. Most are anxious to do well—social, economically, and as loyal citizens in our democratic society. Poverty results when people lack skills necessary to earn a living. Florida has made impressive advances in increased per capita income. But too many people and families still earn sub-standard incomes. At the time of the last census, for example, over one-fourth of the families in Florida had less than \$3000 annual income.

New studies are underway to arrange new training programs to prepare people for full-time jobs and to increase their incomes. Thus, recently, a woman in one Florida community with three part-time jobs, and children, was enrolled in a training program to be a checkout cashier in a supermarket or in a similar job. She was training so that she might be better able to support herself and her children and to become a self-supporting contributor to the economy. She finished her work and will now have five or six days of work every week instead of three part-time jobs. She will now have employment and earn higher and more steady wages. Thus vocational and technical education is concerned with human values—for human beings and for state and national values.

Vocational education helps solve problems due to technological unemployment. It also helps solve the problem created in Florida when new industries need additional employees. Recently, a "crash" program was inaugurated in one county to provide personnel trained in a number of vocations needed by a new company. The employees were trained in the schools and the company was able to meet its opening date.

Unemployment and the under-utilization of manpower resources results in vast costs against the economy of a state and nation. Economists have reported that the greatest total cost of any operation in the history of the nation was the great depression of 1930-40 when trillions of dollars were the cost of lost productivity. Recently the Council of Economic Advisors reported that the loss in gross national product from unemployment was about \$50 billion in the first quarter of 1961. They reported that the unemployment rate of 4.2% in the last quarter of 1965 would account for an annual rate of about \$7 billion loss to the U.S. economy.

Vocational educators in Florida are concerned with programs in research and development to help solve problems of unemployment in the state. Studies are underway to incorporate new processes which are appearing in industry, new instruments, new machines, and new techniques for work into instructional programs. Educators are alert to needs for updating curricula to meet technological and social needs. The Research Coordinating Unit of the Division acts to stimulate and coordinate research in vocational and technical education at all levels. Special studies are a continuing project to determine employment opportunities in each county and area of Florida.

Florida is also cooperating with other states in conducting research to improve vocational education. For example, the state is one of several participating in a study of the block-time laboratory approach to office education. The project is a research and development program in vocational-technical education of the Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum of Michigan State University. The objective is to improve methods of educating persons for office occupations. Simulated office conditions allow education of "the whole

worker." Thus, the students and teacher view the office course in its entirety instead of as a series of disconnected tasks. Areas of instruction include classroom experiences, laboratory experiences, and problem-solving experiences. Again, classrooms and equipment are like those found in offices and businesses. The whole project is only one of many studies underway to improve educational methods and techniques.

Of major importance to Florida and to the nation are the implications of vocational and technical education for the national defense effort. Adequate and proper defense of the nation is based upon thousands of highly trained workers in a great variety of vocations and technologies. Actually, the defense, space, and atomic energy programs of the nation have generated more jobs than all other federal programs combined. The first employ over 9 million persons and the latter employ under 2 million persons.

Florida has been particularly active in fulfilling her role in the space age and is offering many vocational and technical programs to furnish trained employees. Programs include electronics, data processing, micro-miniaturization, electricity, drafting and comparable supportive services. Also, Florida has expanded offerings in occupations related to health. The latter include work to train for nursing, certified laboratory technician, medical assistant, surgical assistant, dental assistant, and the like.

The economy of the South and of Florida is changing. Relatively fewer people are needed in agricultural work; and, as people withdraw from the latter, they must prepare to enter new occupations. Individuals in Florida must be trained to work in the many light industries which are moving to the state. The Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education is alert to the needs for counseling services to inform youth and adults of job opportunities and the preparation which is required.

The Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education and the State Department of Education are continually engaged in planning new and more varied vocational programs to serve more people and more businesses, and to meet the changes which Florida's progress demands.

BILL INTRODUCED TO ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, President John F. Kennedy said in a message to the Congress concerning consumer problems, that the four basic rights of the consumer are "the right to be safe, the right to choose, the right to be informed, and the right to be heard." There are few who would argue with this Magna Carta of consumer rights, but many who question the willingness and ability of our Federal Government to implement and make these rights meaningful.

To begin with, producer interests in this country exercise a disproportionate influence over economic policy. It is, of course, natural that such interests should organize and finance powerful lobbies. Equally proper is their representation by

Cabinet-level Departments—Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. What troubles many of us, however, is the absence of any equivalent and countervailing political power for the consumer.

No one can reasonably doubt that consumers have a stake in the operation of the free enterprise system equal to that of producers and workers. Certainly all three share the risks of the system and are entitled to its rewards. However, present governmental structure lends itself to the advancement of the interests of producers and workers but not to the advancement of the interests of consumers. Given the fact that the consumer interest is often in conflict with other interests which are aggressively promoted by the Government, the consumer tends to be isolated from the making of important economic decisions which directly affect him.

Thus, for example, the State Department or the Department of Commerce can recommend tariff agreements affecting the price or quality of major consumer commodities without having given adequate consideration to the interests of consumers. Thus, the Department of Agriculture's milk marketing administration can make decisions affecting the local price of milk without having taken into account the views of consumers. Thus, in fiscal year 1966, without benefit of a consumer point of view, the United States exported nearly a billion dollars worth of wheat at a time when the price of bread was rising dramatically at home. Thus, while the Department of Interior can influence the price of gasoline by loosening and tightening petroleum imports, the consumer is excluded from the decisionmaking process.

Historically, the regulatory agencies were intended to protect the consumer interest in our Government. Yet they have become subject to producer pressures which far outweigh any countervailing power exercised by consumers. Any study of regulatory agencies will reveal their preoccupation with settling the conflicting claims of rival producers. The Interstate Commerce Commission mediates disputes between railroads and trucking firms. The Civil Aeronautics Board adjudicates the competing claims of large certified carriers and smaller airlines. The Federal Communications Commission referees the battle of the networks and the competition between financial interests which compete for scarce channels. The Federal Power Commission is caught between gas producers and public utility companies. And the Tariff Commission arbitrates free trade and protectionist squabbles.

At the present time some 33 Federal agencies are engaged in 296 consumer protection activities. However, no single agency has responsibility for coordinating even the most important of these activities. Thus, the consumer interest, which is perhaps the most widely shared in our society, has no articulate, effective representation within our government.

While there are differences of opinion as to the institutional form increased Federal consumer protection should take, President Lyndon B. Johnson said in 1964:

For far too long, the consumer has had too little voice and too little weight in government. As a worker, as a lawyer or doctor, the citizen has been well represented. But as a consumer, he has had to take a back seat . . . We cannot rest content until he is in the front row, not displacing the interest of the producer, yet gaining equal rank and representation with that interest.

It is often claimed that the consumer interest cannot be specifically represented by any one agency since that interest, by definition, includes us all. Yet the specificity of an interest is not determined by the number of individuals who happen to share it. We all breathe air, and hence maintain an interest as distinct as that of factories whose activities may impart air-polluting byproducts. We all cross streets and hence have an interest in controlled traffic, which may conflict with the motorists' interest in the speediest possible flow. Motorists, in turn, cross streets, breathe air, or may even be factory foremen. Interest, in other words, overlap and are defined by particular roles within a society. In many cases the consumer interest is particular and specific, quite distinguishable from other interests, and thus a distinct ingredient in the general public interest.

In order to fill what I believe to be a serious "representation gap" in our governmental system, I am today introducing a new bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs.

The introduction of this legislation marks the third year of my efforts to secure full representation at the Cabinet level for the American consumer. Support for this legislation is widespread and of long standing. In 1959, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, Estes Kefauver, joined by 22 other Senators, proposed the creation of a Federal department devoted exclusively to consumer affairs. In hearings held on the Kefauver bill, Vice President, then Senator, HUMPHREY said:

I think we need a Department of Consumers. I am not at all sure that this bill has all the features in it that it ought to have, but I am convinced that somebody ought to speak up for the great multitude of American people who are not organized into a consumer interest group.

Since that time many other Members of Congress have supported such a proposal.

During hearings held in the 89th Congress by the House Committee on Government Operations on my bill to create a Department of Consumer Affairs, Senators PHILIP A. HART and ROBERT F. KENNEDY testified in support of the proposal. Senator KENNEDY said:

As long as consumer protection is not focused as the major responsibility of a single department or agency, as long as the consumers lack effective and direct representation in the highest councils of the Federal Government, they will not have the protection that they need and that they deserve.

The concept of a separate Cabinet-level department for the representation of the consumer is neither new nor untried. In both Sweden and Norway such departments are already in existence. A joint committee of the Canadian Parliament only recently endorsed this concept when it stated in a report that—

Your committee . . . feels that the function of consumer protection is of such urgency as to require the establishment of a department of consumer affairs.

In an Executive order of January 1964, establishing the President's Consumer Advisory Council, President Johnson directed that the distinguished group of private citizens comprising the Council advise the Government "on governmental programs to meet consumer needs or to protect consumer interests." In respect to this mandate, the Council recommended to the President in its June 1966 report that—

The consumer interest must be represented in its own right at the highest echelons of Government in a cabinet department.

In addition, the National Commission on Food Marketing in its report to the President of June 30, 1966, recommended that—

A centralized consumer agency should be established in the Executive Branch of the Government by statute.

My bill for a Department of Consumer Affairs is an expanded and improved version of the bill I introduced during the 89th Congress. It contains several new elements: Provisions of an Office of Consumer Information, including a foundation to administer the informative labeling system, Info-Tag; an Office of Consumer Safety; an Institute for Consumer Research; and the transfer of additional consumer functions from other agencies. These are all provisions which would strengthen the Department's capacity to protect the buying public and disseminate comprehensive information of value to consumers.

Specifically, the bill provides for the following:

GOVERNMENTAL REPRESENTATION

First. Representation of the consumer interest before Federal courts and regulatory agencies in matters or proceedings substantially affecting the interests of American consumers—section 6.

Second. Representation of the consumer interest before Federal departments and agencies at the time when governmental decisions are made or policies arrived at which vitally affect the interests of the American consumer—section 6(d).

COMPLAINTS

Third. The receipt and disposition of consumer complaints over which the Department has jurisdiction; and the transmittal to other Federal agencies of consumer complaints over which the Department does not have jurisdiction—section 7.

Fourth. To seek the cessation of acts or practices in the trade or commerce of the United States which are inimical to the interests of consumers—section 7(d).

INFORMATION

Fifth. Establishment of an Office of Consumer Information, which shall develop on its own initiative, gather from other Federal departments and agencies and non-Federal sources and disseminate to the public, statistics, data, and other information concerning: functions and duties of the Department; problems encountered by consumers generally within the United States, and the nature

and extent of information in the possession of departments and agencies of the Federal Government which would be useful to consumers.

NATIONAL CONSUMER INFORMATION FOUNDATION

There is established within the Department an independent, self-supporting foundation which will test products and offer consumers meaningful information on their performance and safety characteristics.

The system to be known as "Info-Tag," resembling the British "Teltag," literally refers to a tag on the product which provides information about its performance. The voluntary labeling system proposed in this legislation would not grade or classify products as "best buys." But it would describe the characteristics of interest to the consumer, leaving the final choice or selection up to him.

SAFETY

There shall be in the Department an Office of Consumer Safety. It is the duty of the Office:

First. To conduct a continuing investigation of the scope and adequacy of measures now employed to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injuries which may be caused by hazardous household products.

Second. Pursuant to rules which shall protect the right of all interested parties to be heard, to identify and publish information concerning consumer products determined to present an unreasonable hazard to the health and safety of the consuming public.

CONSUMER RESEARCH

There shall be in the Department an Institute for Consumer Research which shall test products for the Consumer Information Foundation, conduct scientific research on consumer products, and develop new techniques with which consumers can evaluate products.

TRANSFER OF EXISTING FUNCTIONS

There shall be transferred to the Department in section 12 of the bill:

First, those elements of the Consumer and Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, which relate to the standardization, grading, or classing of agricultural commodities for consumer consumption;

Second, the Division of Prices and Cost of Living of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor which has detailed price information of value to consumers;

Third, the Home Economics Research Branch and the Human Nutrition Research Branch of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture;

Fourth, all functions, powers, and duties vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Commerce by the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (Public Law; 80 Stat. 1296);

Fifth, all functions, powers, and duties vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which relate to the misbranding of food and establishing for any food a reasonable definition and standard of identity, stand-

ard of quality, and/or standards of fill of container.

ECONOMIC SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS

Section 13 of the bill authorizes the Department to carry on widespread economic surveys and investigations.

When I first introduced the Department of Consumers bill in April of 1965, it was apparent to me that the establishment of a Cabinet-level Department to protect and promote the economic interests of consumers was highly desirable. Testimony received during hearings on that bill, the recommendations of two high-level Presidential commissions, and recent price increases in certain consumer commodities demonstrate that a Department of Consumers is absolutely essential. If we are to give meaning to the consumer "bill of rights" as enunciated by President Kennedy and vitality to the view that a "new and progressive program is needed if we are to protect the American consumer's right in the marketplace," as stated by President Johnson, then we must move swiftly and boldly on behalf of the consumer by establishing a Department of Consumer Affairs.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 7114

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Consumers Act of 1967".

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMERS ESTABLISHED

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established, as an executive department of the Government, the Department of Consumer Affairs (referred to hereinafter as the "Department").

(b) Section 101 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Department of Consumer Affairs,"

(c) Section 19(d)(1) of title 3, United States Code, is amended by inserting therein, immediately after "Secretary of Transportation" the following: ", Secretary of Consumer Affairs."

OFFICERS OF THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 3. (a)(1) The Department shall be headed by a Secretary of Consumer Affairs (referred to hereinafter as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(2) Section 5312 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(13) Secretary of Consumer Affairs."

(b)(1) There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary of Consumer Affairs (referred to hereinafter as the "Under Secretary") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Under Secretary shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary shall prescribe. During the absence or disability of the Secretary, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Secretary, the Under Secretary shall act as Secretary.

(2) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(46) Under Secretary of Consumer Affairs."

(c)(1) There shall be in the Department three Assistant Secretaries of Consumer Affairs (each referred to hereinafter as an "Assistant Secretary") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each Assistant Secretary shall perform such duties

and exercise such powers as the Secretary shall prescribe.

(2) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(84) Assistant Secretaries of Consumer Affairs (3)."

(d)(1) There shall be in the Department a General Counsel (referred to hereinafter as the "Consumer Counsel") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Consumer Counsel shall be the chief legal officer of the Department, and shall perform such duties as the Secretary may direct. During the absence or disability, or in the event of vacancies in the offices of the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretaries, the Consumer Counsel shall act as Secretary.

(2) Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(118) Consumer Counsel of the Department of Consumer Affairs."

(e) No officer of the Department may engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while serving as such. No individual may be appointed or serve as an officer of the Department—

(1) while he holds legal title to, or beneficial equitable interest in, share capital (A) exceeding in market value \$ _____ in any corporation engaged in the production, distribution, or sale of goods or services affecting consumers, or (B) exceeding in market value \$ _____ in more than one such operation; or

(2) if within _____ years he has served as an officer or director of any such corporation.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall be responsible for the exercise of all powers and the discharge of all duties of the Department, and shall have authority to direct and supervise all personnel and activities thereof.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be required for the performance of the functions of the Department.

(c) The Secretary may promulgate such rules as may be necessary to carry out the functions vested in him or in the Department, and he may delegate authority for the performance of any such function to any officer or employee under his direction and supervision.

(d) The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

(e) The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include a comprehensive statement of the activities and accomplishments of the Department during the preceding calendar year, and such recommendations for additional legislation as he may determine to be necessary or desirable to protect the interests of consumers within the United States. A separate report shall be prepared and submitted by the National Consumers Information Foundation established by section 9 of this act.

FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 5. (a) It is the duty of the Department, in the performance of its functions, to protect and promote the interests of the people of the United States as consumers of goods and services made available to them through the trade and commerce of the United States.

(b) The functions of the Department include the following:

(1) To present the viewpoint of consumers of goods and services within the United States in the formulation of policies of the Government;

(2) To represent the interests of consumers of the United States in proceedings before courts and regulatory agencies of the

United States to the extent to which authorization therefor is provided by section 6 of this Act;

(3) To develop on its own initiative, receive from Federal agencies and other public and private sources, and assemble, evaluate, act upon, and disseminate information helpful to consumers of the United States, including information concerning commercial and trade practices adversely affecting their interests, as provided by section 7 of this Act;

(4) To conduct annually a National Consumers' Conference, to be attended by experts on consumer affairs and by representatives of organizations engaged in fostering and protecting the interests of consumers of goods and services within the United States, for the purpose of obtaining information, recommendations, and suggestions necessary or desirable for the effective performance of other functions of the Department;

(5) To discharge in the public interest the powers and duties transferred to the Department by section 8 of this Act; and

(6) To perform such other functions as may be prescribed by law.

REPRESENTATION OF CONSUMERS

SEC. 6. (a) Whenever there is pending before any regulatory agency of the United States (as defined by section 12 of this Act) any matter or proceeding which does not involve the adjudication of the alleged violation, by any individual or corporation named as a defendant or respondent therein, of any statute of the United States or any rule promulgated thereunder, and the Secretary find that the determination of such matter or proceeding may affect substantially the interests of consumers within the United States, the Department shall be entitled as a matter of right to intervene in such matter or proceeding as a party to represent the interest of consumers by filing with such agency a duly certified copy of the finding so made by the Secretary. Upon any such intervention, the Department, through the Consumer Counsel or any other officer or employee of the Department designated by the Secretary for that purpose, shall present to such regulatory agency, in conformity with the rules of practice and procedure thereof, such evidence, briefs, and argument as it shall determine to be necessary for the effective protection of the interests of such consumers.

(b) Whenever—

(1) there is pending before any regulatory agency of the United States any matter or proceeding relating to the trade or commerce of the United States which does involve the adjudication of the alleged violation, by any individual or corporation named as a defendant or respondent therein, of any statute of the United States, or any rule promulgated thereunder, or

(2) there is pending before any district court of the United States any matter or proceeding involving the trade or commerce of the United States to which the United States or any regulatory agency of the United States is a party,

the Department upon its own motion may, and upon written request made by the officer or employee of the United States or such regulatory agency who is charged with the duty of presenting the case for the Government in that matter or proceeding shall, certify to such officer or employee all evidence and information in the possession of the Department relevant to that matter or proceeding.

(c) Whenever there is pending before any appellate court of the United States any matter or proceeding involving the review of—

(1) an order or determination made by any regulatory agency of the United States relating to the trade or commerce of the United States, or

(2) any judgment, decree, or order entered by a district court of the United States in any civil action involving the trade or commerce of the United States,

and the Secretary finds that the action taken by the appellate court upon such review may affect substantially the interests of consumers within the United States, the Department, subject to the rules of practice and procedure of such appellate court, may make application to that court for leave to file in such matter or proceeding a brief as amicus curiae, or to present to the court oral argument therein, or both, except that no such application may be filed by the Department without the consent of the Attorney General in any matter or proceeding (A) to which the United States or any regulatory agency of the United States is a party, or (B) in which the Attorney General has been granted leave to intervene on behalf of the United States or any regulatory agency of the United States. Upon the filing by the Department of such application, supported by a duly certified copy of the finding so made by the Secretary and such other showing as the court may require to demonstrate that the action taken upon such review may substantially affect the interests of consumers within the United States, the appellate court in its discretion may grant such application.

(d) Whenever there is pending before any department or independent agency of the United States any matter or proceeding relating to the trade or commerce of the United States which does not involve the adjudication of the alleged violation, by any individual or corporation named as a defendant or respondent therein, of any statute of the United States, or any rule promulgated thereunder, and the Secretary finds that the determination of such matter or proceeding may affect substantially the interests of consumers within the United States, the Department shall be entitled as a matter of right to intervene in such matter or proceeding as a party to represent the interest of consumers by filing with such agency a duly certified copy of the finding so made by the Secretary. Upon any such intervention, the Department shall present to such agency, in conformity with the rules of practice and procedures thereof, all evidence and information in the possession of the Department relevant to that matter or proceeding.

(e) The Consumer Counsel, or any other attorney of the Department specially designated by the Secretary for that purpose, shall be entitled to enter an appearance on behalf of the Department before any court (except the United States Supreme Court) or regulatory agency of the United States, without other compliance with any requirement for admission to practice before such court or agency, for the purpose of making any application or taking any action which is authorized by subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of this section.

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS

Sec. 7. (a) It shall be duty of the Department to receive from consumers of the United States, and to evaluate, complaints concerning commercial and trade practices employed in the production, distribution, and furnishing of goods and services to or for the use of such consumers which may be detrimental to their interests.

(b) Upon receipt of any complaint disclosing the use of any commercial or trade practice detrimental to the interests of consumers within the United States by any producer, distributor, or supplier of goods or services, the Department may transmit to such producer, distributor, or supplier written notice as to the nature of the practice concerning which complaint has been made, and shall take such other action within the authority of the Department as may be appropriate to secure for the complainant relief from such practice. If effective action to secure such

relief for the complainant cannot be taken by the Department under authority conferred upon it, such complaint shall be transmitted by the Department to the department or agency of the United States whose regulatory or other authority provides the most effective available means to secure such relief for the complainant. The department or agency shall then consider the complaint so transmitted, take such action thereon as that department or agency shall determine to be appropriate, and transmit to the complainant a written reply describing the action so taken or, if no action is taken upon such complaint, the reason for its inaction. A copy of each such reply shall be transmitted to the Department.

(c) Whenever the Department receives from any source any information disclosing a probable violation of (1) any law of the United States, (2) any rule or order of any administrative officer or regulatory agency of the United States, or (3) any judgment, decree, or order of any court of the United States, relating to the trade or commerce of the United States, the Department shall transmit promptly, to the officer or agency charged with the duty of enforcing such law, rule, order, judgment, or decree, for appropriate action, such evidence and information as the Department may have concerning such probable violation. It shall be the continuing duty of the Department to ascertain the nature and extent of action taken with regard to probable violations so reported.

(d) Whenever the Department receives or develops on its own initiative information disclosing the existence of an act or practice in the trade or commerce of the United States which is inimical to the interests of consumers, the Department shall take such action within its authority as may be appropriate to cause a cessation of such act or practice. If effective action cannot be taken by the Department under authority conferred upon it, notice of the existence of such act or practice shall be transmitted by the Department to the department or agency of the United States whose regulatory or other authority provides the most effective available means to cause a cessation of such act or practice inimical to the interests of consumers. That department or agency shall then consider the act or practice, notice of which has been transmitted, take such action thereon as that department or agency shall determine to be appropriate, and keep the Department of Consumer Affairs advised as to any action taken.

CONSUMER INFORMATION; OFFICE OF CONSUMER INFORMATION

Sec. 8. (a) It shall be the duty of the Department to develop on its own initiative, gather from other Federal departments and agencies and non-Federal sources, and to disseminate to the public in such manner, at such times, and in such form as the Department determines to be most effective, information, statistics and other data concerning—

(1) the functions and duties of the Department;

(2) problems encountered by consumers generally within the United States, including particular commercial and trade practices which are detrimental to the interests of such consumers;

(3) the nature and extent of information, data, statistics, in the possession of departments and agencies of the United States which, in the judgment of the Department, would be useful to consumers, and to this end, each Federal agency is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Department to the fullest extent practicable.

(b) There shall be in the Department an Office of Consumer Information (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Office"). The head of the Office shall be an Assistant

Secretary of Consumer Affairs designated by the Secretary. It shall be the duty of the Assistant Secretary to administer the functions prescribed by this section and to serve as Chairman of the Board of the National Consumer Information Foundation.

(c) The Secretary shall include as a part of his annual report specific information with respect to the activities of the Office and its success in obtaining and disseminating information with respect to information available from other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

NATIONAL CONSUMER INFORMATION FOUNDATION; INFO-TAG SYSTEM

Sec. 9. (a) There shall be in the Department a foundation which shall be known as the National Consumer Information Foundation (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Foundation").

(b) (1) The Foundation shall be headed by a Board of Directors composed of four Directors appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and the Assistant Secretary having jurisdiction over the Office of Consumer Information who shall serve as Chairman. A vacancy among appointive members of the Board of Directors shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(2) Except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection, Directors of the Foundation other than the Assistant Secretary who is Chairman ex officio of the Foundation shall be appointed for terms of three years.

(3) Of the Directors first appointed, one shall be appointed for a term of one year, two shall be appointed for a term of two years, and one shall be appointed for a term of three years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment.

(4) Any Director of the Foundation appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. A Director may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office.

(5) In the exercise of its functions, powers, and duties, the Foundation shall be independent of the Secretary and other offices and officers of the Department; except that the Assistant Secretary having jurisdiction over the Office of Consumer Information shall serve as Chairman of the Board of Directors.

(c) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(78) Directors, National Consumer Information Foundation."

(d) Three Directors of the Foundation shall constitute a quorum.

(e) (1) The Foundation shall have an Administrator who shall be appointed by the Board of Directors. The Administrator shall administer the Foundation in accordance with directives of the Board of Directors.

(2) The Board of Directors may appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as it deems advisable to carry out the provisions of this section.

Info-tag system

(f) (1) The Foundation shall establish and operate a system under which it may grant authority to a person who manufactures for sale at retail a nonperishable manufactured consumer product to affix to such product a label to be called an info-tag.

(2) The Foundation shall have the authority to develop and approve a standard info-tag which specifies the kind of information to be provided for each type of product for which info-tags are to be made available. A standard info-tag shall bear (A) the name, seal, or other distinctive mark of the Foundation and (B) such information with respect to performance, content, safety, durability, care, and other characteristics as the

Foundation determines to be necessary or useful to permit a reasonably prudent consumer to evaluate a particular product for purposes of purchase.

(3) The standard info-tag for any type of product shall be developed by the Foundation after consultation with interested manufacturers, distributors, and users, and shall be prescribed in rules of the Foundation. The Foundation may, if it determines it to be in the public interest, prescribe data formulated by reputable standard-making bodies, including trade associations and similar groups.

(4) At least ninety days before any such rules are prescribed by the Foundation for any product, such rules shall be published in the Federal Register.

(5) Any person may file written objections to the adoption of any such rules until the sixtieth day after the date of publication of such proposed rules in the Federal Register. After reviewing such objections and other pertinent information, the Foundation may, by order, adopt and promulgate such rules, amend such rules, or refuse to adopt such rules. Such an order of the Foundation shall not be subject to review.

(6) The Foundation shall by rule establish schedules of fees and charges which shall be paid by persons participating or seeking participation in the info-tag system. Such fees and charges shall be related to the cost to the Foundation of carrying out the functions and providing the materials and services for which they are paid, but shall include such surcharge as the Foundation determines to be equitable but necessary in order to place the Foundation on a self-sustaining financial basis.

(7) Before authority is granted to any applicant to affix info-tags to any product, the Foundation must (1) have on file a report from the Institute for Consumer Research (established by section 11) or an independent testing laboratory determined by it to be reliable setting forth the information which should be on the info-tag to be affixed to such product, and (2) have received payment of all fees and charges fixed by it and due in connection with the granting of such authority.

(8) The Foundation shall not declare one product to be better, or a better buy, than any other product.

(9) The Foundation shall maintain constant surveillance over products to which info-tags are affixed to assure that such products conform to information on the info-tags affixed to them and may require additional testing to assure that specimens of the product to which an info-tag has been affixed conform in every respect with information on such info-tag.

(10) The Foundation may revoke or suspend authority granted under this section for willful or repeated violations of rules issued by the Foundation in connection with the info-tag system under this section.

(11) The Foundation may by rule exclude any nonperishable manufactured consumer product or class of such products from the info-tag system under this section if it determines that inclusion of such product or class of products would not be beneficial to a substantial number of the consumers of such product or class of products, or would not lend itself to such a system.

(g) Whoever counterfeits an info-tag, or knowingly and willfully affixes an info-tag to any product other than a product with respect to which authority granted by the Foundation is in effect therefor, for the purpose of selling such product to another person, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(h) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this section, the Foundation may—

(1) Establish and maintain a reference library and related facilities and utilize the facilities of the Institute for Consumer Research;

(2) Make such investigations as it deems necessary (A) to determine if any person has violated or is about to violate any provision of this section or any rule or order of the Foundation or (B) to aid in enforcing this section or in formulating rules or orders;

(3) Use, on a reimbursable basis, the services, equipment, personnel, supplies, and facilities of Federal departments and agencies and, on a reimbursable or other basis, other public or nonprofit persons, institutions, or organizations;

(4) Enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as it may determine to be necessary on such terms as it may determine to be appropriate;

(5) Appoint such advisory committees and consultants for such periods of time as it determines;

(6) Make, issue, rescind, or amend rules governing the manner of its operation and the exercise of its functions;

(7) Publish and disseminate reports and publications;

(8) Establish an official seal which shall be judicially noticed;

(9) Establish and maintain such field offices in the United States and abroad as it may determine to be necessary; and

(10) Engage in, and support, by grant or contract, research with respect to, and development of, objective or quantitative standards for nonperishable manufactured consumer products.

(1) The Foundation shall transmit to the President and the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include a comprehensive statement of the activities of the Foundation during the preceding calendar year, together with such recommendations for additional legislation as it may deem useful or necessary to carry out any of the provisions of this section.

(j) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section until the Foundation is operating on a financially self-sustaining basis.

OFFICE OF CONSUMER SAFETY

SEC. 10. (a) There shall be in the Department an Office of Consumer Safety (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Office").

(b) The head of the Office shall be an Assistant Secretary of Consumer Affairs designated by the Secretary.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Office—

(1) To conduct a continuing study and investigation of the scope and adequacy of measures now employed to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injuries which may be caused by hazardous household products. Such study and investigation shall include consideration of the following:

(A) the identity of household products, except such products excluded in subsection (d) of this section, which are determined to present an unreasonable hazard to the health and safety of the consuming public;

(B) the extent to which self-regulation by industry affords such protection;

(C) the protection against such hazardous products afforded at common law in the States, including the relationship of product warranty to such protection; and

(D) a review of Federal, State, and local laws relating to the protection of consumers against such hazardous products, including the scope of coverage, the effectiveness of sanctions, the adequacy of investigatory powers, the uniformity of application, and the quality of enforcement.

(2) Pursuant to rules to be established by the Secretary protecting the right of all interested parties to be heard, to identify and publish information concerning consumer products determined to present an unreasonable hazard to the health and safety of the consuming public; except that the Office shall avoid to the greatest extent practicable publishing such information in a form which would give an unfair competitive advantage to any person. Information which would separately disclose the business transactions of any person, trade secrets, or names of customers shall be held confidential and shall not be disclosed.

(d) There shall be excluded from the operation of this section, products regulated under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.), the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 1261 et seq.), the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 135 et seq.).

INSTITUTE FOR CONSUMER RESEARCH

SEC. 11. (a) There shall be in the Department an Institute for Consumer Research (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Institute").

(b) The Institute shall—

(1) Develop methods for testing materials, mechanisms, and structures used in consumer products;

(2) test articles used or intended for use by consumers and make tests requested by the National Consumer Information Foundation;

(3) compile, analyze, and publish statistical data and other information and data of benefit and interest to consumers, whether resulting from activities of the Department or other departments or agencies of the Federal Government or from other sources; and

(4) make recommendations to other departments and agencies of the Federal Government as to research, studies, analyses, and other information which could result from carrying out their functions, powers, or duties which would be useful and beneficial to consumers.

(c) Insofar as personnel and equipment are available therefor, the Institute may carry out studies and research for other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 12. (a) All functions, powers, duties, and obligations; all officers, employees, property, and records; and all unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available), of the following agencies or parts of agencies are hereby transferred to the Secretary:

(1) Those elements of the Consumer and Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, which relate to the standardization, grading, or classing of agricultural commodities for consumer consumption;

(2) The Division of Prices and Cost of Living of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor;

(3) The Home Economics Research Branch and the Human Nutrition Research Branch of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture;

(4) All functions, powers, and duties vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Commerce by the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (Public Law; 80 Stat. 1296);

(5) All functions, powers, and duties vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (52 Stat. 1040) which relate to establishing for any food a reasonable definition and standard of identity, standard of quality and/or standards of fill of container (21 U.S.C. 341) and the misbranding of food (21 U.S.C. 343); and such functions, powers, and duties transferred to and vested in the Secretary shall be administered in the manner prescribed in subsections (a), (d), (e), (f), and (g) of section 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 371).

(b) This section shall take effect one hun-

dred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, or on such earlier date on which the Secretary determines, and announces by proclamation published in the Federal Register, that the Department has been organized and is prepared to exercise the powers conferred and discharge the duties imposed upon it by this Act.

ECONOMIC SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS

SEC. 13. (a) It shall be the duty of the Department, in the public interest—

(1) to conduct economic surveys and investigations with respect to—

(A) the productive capacity for, and the production of, goods affecting consumers within the United States;

(B) the systems and mechanisms in use for the distribution of such goods, and the effects thereof;

(C) the levels of prices for goods and services affecting consumers, the factors entering into their establishment, and their reasonableness;

(D) the quality and suitability of goods affecting consumers, and the factors influencing the quality and suitability of such goods; and

(E) the degree to which the trade and commerce of the United States succeeds in satisfying consumer needs for goods and services; and

(2) to analyze and disseminate to the public information obtained through such investigations and surveys.

(b) In the conduct of such surveys and investigations, the Department shall have power—

(1) to gather and compile information concerning, and from time to time to investigate, the productive capacity; volume of production; selling prices; costs of production and distribution; volume of sales, assets, and earnings; and relationship to any other corporation, of any corporation engaged in commerce which has assets exceeding \$5,000,000 in value, and of any division or subsidiary thereof;

(2) to require any such corporation, or any division or subsidiary thereof, to file with the Department in such form as it may prescribe annual or special, or both annual and special, reports or answers in writing to specific questions, furnishing to the Department such information as it may require with regard to the factors described in clause (1), which reports and answers shall be made under oath if so prescribed by the Department, and shall be filed with the Department within such reasonable period as it may prescribe;

(3) to investigate from time to time trade conditions in and with foreign countries affecting the foreign trade and commerce of the United States, and their influence upon domestic price levels; and

(4) except as provided by subsection (c), to make public from time to time such portions of the information obtained by it hereunder as it deems expedient in the public interest, and to provide for the publication of its reports in such manner and form as may be best adapted for public information and use.

(c) Information received by the Department concerning the cost of production or distribution of any product by any such corporation, or any division or subsidiary thereof, may be made public only in a form which does not disclose such information with respect to any particular corporation, or any division or subsidiary thereof.

(d) For the purpose of conducting surveys and investigations under this Act, the Department shall have all powers which are conferred upon the Federal Trade Commission by section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to the conduct of investigations made by that Commission under that Act, except that the Department may not grant to any person any immunity from prosecution, penalty, or forfeiture in accordance with the provisions of that sec-

tion without first obtaining the written consent of the Attorney General and serving upon such person a duly certified copy of any consent therefor granted by the Attorney General. The provisions of section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act shall apply to the act or omission of any person, partnership, or corporation with regard to any subpoena, order, requirement, or information of the Department to the same extent, and with the same effect, as if such act or omission had occurred with regard to a like subpoena, order, or requirement, or with reference to like information, of the Federal Trade Commission.

(e) Prior to conducting major economic surveys and investigations authorized by this section, the Secretary shall take all practicable and reasonable steps to ascertain whether any such economic survey and investigation would duplicate in significant degree recent economic surveys and investigations by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission. If, in the determination of the Secretary of Consumer Affairs, such a duplication would occur, the Secretary shall not undertake such proposed economic survey or investigation, unless he determines that said economic survey or investigation is absolutely essential to the performance of the duties of the Department.

CONSULTING SERVICES AND COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 14. (a) In the performance of its functions, the Department is authorized—

(1) to procure by contract services as provided by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates of compensation not exceeding \$100 per diem for the personal services of individuals;

(2) to appoint such advisory committees as it may determine to be necessary for the effective performance of its functions;

(3) to designate representatives to serve on such committees as the Department may determine to be necessary or desirable to maintain effective liaison with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States or any State, and with non-governmental organizations, engaged in activities related to the functions of the Department; and

(4) to use the services, personnel, and facilities of other Federal, State, and private agencies and instrumentalities with the consent of such agencies and instrumentalities, with or without reimbursement therefor.

(b) Upon request made by the Secretary, each department, agency, and instrumentality of the United States is authorized and directed—

(1) to make its services, personnel, and facilities available to the greatest practicable extent within its capability to the Department in the performance of its functions; and

(2) subject to provisions of law, Executive orders, and rules relating to the classification of information in the interest of national security, to furnish to the Department such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics as the Secretary may determine to be necessary for the performance of the functions of the Department.

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 15. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, modify, or impair the statutory responsibility and authority contained in section 201(a) (4) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 481(a) (4)), or of any provision of the antitrust laws, or of any Act providing for the regulation of the trade or commerce of the United States, or to prevent or impair the administration or enforcement of any such provision of law.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as relieving any department or agency of the Federal Government of any

authority or responsibility, not transferred to or authorized by this Act to be performed by the Department, to protect and promote the economic interests of the American consumer.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 16. As used in this Act—

(a) The terms "commerce" and "corporation" have the meaning given to such terms by section 4 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44);

(b) The term "regulatory agency of the United States" includes the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Maritime Commission, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the United States Tariff Commission, and any other board, commission, or other agency of the United States hereafter established which is charged with administrative or regulatory duties with respect to the trade or commerce of the United States.

(c) The term "antitrust law" includes—

(1) each provision of law defined as one of the antitrust laws by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 12), commonly known as the Clayton Act;

(2) the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 and the following);

(3) section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 13), and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1936 (15 U.S.C. 13a), commonly known as the Robinson-Patman Act; and

(4) any statute hereafter enacted by the Congress which prohibits, or makes available to the United States any remedy with respect to, any restraint upon or monopolization of commerce, or any unfair trade practice or unfair method of competition in or affecting commerce.

(d) The term "State" includes any State or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department such sums as may be required to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SHORTCOMINGS IN THE NATION'S PUBLIC WELFARE SYSTEM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Providence Journal applauds the attention which the President gave in his economic report to the shortcomings in the Nation's public welfare system.

The article says that Mr. Johnson is correct in stating that—

We should encourage self-help and not penalize it.

And that—

The standards of need set by many states are unrealistically low.

It praises Mr. Johnson's desire to explore the possibilities of a guaranteed income, while putting an end to those deficiencies in the present system which perpetuate dependence instead of encouraging self-sufficiency. It calls on the Congress and the Federal and State governments to face up to the obligation to correct the inadequacies plaguing our public assistance program.

I believe that its insights will be of interest to my colleagues and I include it in the RECORD:

[From the Providence Journal, Jan. 31, 1967]

A WAY TO SHORTEN WELFARE ROLLS

President Johnson in his Economic Report has taken official notice of shortcomings in the nation's public welfare system that have been evident for some time.

In a report on a two-year study concluded last June by the Advisory Council on Public Welfare, it was held that "a major updating of our public welfare system is essential if it is to achieve the goal of assuring a basic floor of economic and social security for all Americans."

The President has cited some of the same deficiencies found by the council and said he will ask Congress to take corrective action. He has called for an end to the requirement that for every dollar a welfare recipient earns, a dollar must be deducted from his assistance allotment. "It is time to put an end to this 100 per cent tax on the earnings of those on public assistance," he said.

Mr. Johnson is correct in stating that "we should encourage self-help, not penalize it." Some financial incentive must be provided for the welfare recipient to join the working community. For many undereducated, unskilled persons, this is a gradual process that needs encouragement and economic assistance along the way.

Mr. Johnson is correct in stating that "the standards of need set by many states are unrealistically low; benefits are further restricted by excessively stringent eligibility conditions. In some respects, the system perpetuates dependency."

In addition, the President has said he intends to establish a commission of leading Americans to study proposals for a guaranteed annual income.

For many, particularly those who lead fairly comfortable lives, a time of high welfare costs and labor shortages is an anachronism. The fact is that most welfare recipients are, for a variety of reasons, unemployable: too young or too old, disabled, mothers of young children who must be cared for and persons whose lack of education and training make them unsuitable for the skilled and semi-skilled jobs that are available.

There is little doubt that Congress will approve an increase in Social Security payments this year. The federal government and the states have a like obligation to correct the serious inadequacies plaguing our system of public assistance.

THE CHALLENGE OF CRIME

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore News-American has issued a sobering warning:

Crime is waging a very real war on the fabric of our civilization, and is winning.

And it has also called upon Congress to pass the anticrime proposals of President Johnson to deal with all aspects of this spreading malady.

There must be more police and they must be better trained. There must be new laws to keep guns out of the hands of criminals. And we must strike at the roots of crime with antipoverty and education programs.

The newspaper's editorial, "The Challenge of Crime," pinpoints our responsibility. I include it in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

THE CHALLENGE OF CRIME

President Johnson's call to Congress for vigorous new measures to stem the ever-growing menace of crime and lawlessness will be welcomed by all law-abiding citizens.

For many millions of those citizens, especially in big cities, the feeling of security which should be theirs has long since been replaced by a climate of well-founded fear. To them, crime is the nation's No. 1 social problem.

Even the alarming statistics cited by the President failed to reflect the pressing scope of the crime cancer. An annual loss of \$3 billion in real property through crime is far less personally meaningful than the fact that half the persons interviewed in a recent survey are afraid to leave their homes after dark. Or that unreported crime in some communities is believed 10 times higher than reported.

As part of his proposed new assault, the President again asked for a stiff gun control act. The Hearst Newspapers has long campaigned for such controls and concur with the President's assessment that another failure by Congress to adopt them will be "unconscionable."

We also have urged the outlawing of all wiretapping and electronic snooping except in matters of national security, as requested by Mr. Johnson. And we strongly support his new proposals for federal grants to help strengthen state and local police operations.

The challenge of crime already is being attacked indirectly through the administration's many special programs for slum clearance, job training and other welfare and educational undertakings. It meanwhile must be battled directly and more strongly on its own front. Crime is waging a very real war on the fabric of our civilization, and is winning. The mass store lootings in Chicago after a recent snowstorm show how dangerously thin the veneer of that civilization now is.

It is the clear duty of Congress to act as requested by the President. This nation's spreading climate of crime and disorder makes it imperative.

THE 1967 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide a supplemental appropriation of \$10 million for the fiscal 1967 adult basic education programs operating nationwide under

the terms of the Adult Education Act of 1966.

The adult basic education program was initiated in 1964 with enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act by the 88th Congress and has been administered by the U.S. Office of Education ever since as a State grant program. ABE is primarily aimed at illiterate and undereducated adults whose English language limitations and other educational shortcomings effectively inhibits their employment opportunities and their full assimilation into our progressive, highly specialized society. The program has been concentrated since its inception on areas with the greatest numbers of adults with such educational deficiencies, and very predictably is most operable in poverty areas.

The adult education classes have been a great success in Hawaii as they have been throughout the Nation. To date, 575,000 individuals have participated in the program in the 50 States, District of Columbia, and three territories, and the Office of Education estimates that a cumulative total of 642,000 participants will be reached by June 30, 1967. Encouraging as these figures may appear, the magnitude of the need can be realized by a study of the 1960 Census which revealed that there were approximately 23,900,000 Americans over 18 years of age lacking an eighth-grade education or its equivalent.

It is apparent that the \$64.5 million obligated for adult basic education for the last 3 years, while allowing a promising beginning for a long-overdue program, has not been enough. The problem has been further compounded by the way in which it was originally funded. The fiscal 1965 appropriation was \$19 million, but because many States did not have sufficient time to develop and submit their plans, only \$4,168,836 was obligated in 1965. This left a balance of \$14,443,164 to be carried over into fiscal 1966 and to be added to the \$21 million appropriation for that year.

On the surface this appears to present no problem. More than \$35 million was thus available last year and the adult education program expanded tremendously, with the enrollment spurring from 38,000 to about 373,000. Teachers were hired, classroom facilities located, and community expectations raised through this rapid growth.

However, after all this progress, the 1967 appropriation of \$30 million is not sufficient to even keep the program going at last year's level. When we consider that \$800,000 of these funds will go to Federal office administrative expenses and \$2,920,000 to Special Projects and Teacher Training, the \$26,280,000 remaining for State grants amounts to almost a \$10 million decrease from the \$35 millions which the States had available in 1966 for actual operating expenses. Massive cutbacks in a program which deserves instead to be increased have already begun, and we have little time left to salvage the hard work that has gone into building it up to the level of service it has already reached.

Hawaii has been hard hit by these developments, and my State illustrates the

problem throughout the country. Of the \$80,613 that was our share in 1965, we managed to obligate only \$27,000 by the end of the fiscal year, leaving a carryover of \$53,613 for 1966 to be added to that year's allocations for a grand total of \$195,580 available. For fiscal 1967 Hawaii will receive \$114,819 as its share of the \$30 million, representing a cutback of over 40 percent of the total funds Hawaii expended for this program in fiscal 1966.

Statistics will never adequately replace the individual human success story in reflecting the value of the adult education program, but I submit the U.S. Office of Education tabulations from the 1966 annual report as an impressive record of accomplishment. There were 1,641 local programs operative in the 50 States, District of Columbia, and the eligible territories. Of the 378,906 adults enrolled, the majority were between the ages of 25 and 49, obviously then in an employable range. There were 1,068 guidance and counseling personnel serving in the program and a total of 17,791 teachers, in addition to 1,385 teacher aids. Among the enrollees 125,039 were instructed on grade levels 0-3; 155,351 were instructed at grade levels 4-6; and 98,516 were instructed at 7th-8th grade levels. The student-teacher ratio was 22 to 1, a desirable goal even for our public schools to aim at.

All of these individuals were instructed in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and computational skills, not only to improve their employment opportunities but also to enable them to participate more effectively and broadly as citizens of our democratic society while enriching their daily lives in numerous immeasurable ways.

Let us not now dim the glow of hope that we have lighted among those whose lack of education has burdened and dimmed their adult years and stifled their total growth as human beings. Our obligation is imperative, for as these individuals benefit, so do we all through their increased contribution to our national life. The funds that I am asking for in my bill should be regarded as evidence of our commitment to these largely neglected individuals and a precursor of further expansion of the adult basic education program. I urge early action on this most necessary supplemental appropriation.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, a mighty statue of Taras Shevchenko stands firmly implanted in Washington, D.C. At a great geographic and political distance, in Moscow, stands another statue, also of Taras Shevchenko. Both nations claim this man to be a hero, a

fighter for freedom, a symbol of struggle and perseverance.

To Americans and to Ukrainians, Shevchenko represents a nation's thirst for independence and the battle against oppressive, alien governments. The War of Independence of 1776 and the British immediately spring to mind as the American counterpart to the Ukrainian endeavor. After all, did not Shevchenko implore:

When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law?
And receive him we will some day. . .!

The Russians, however, interpret Shevchenko as a precursor to communism, one who depicted the revolt of peasant against master, the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

Let there be no mistake made here. Taras Shevchenko waged a verbal war against serfdom and injustice, against social and national oppression. He was a humanist; his ideals have universal appeal. But first and foremost, Shevchenko was a patriot, a Ukrainian. Love for his country runs through his veins and through his poetry:

Peaceful land, beloved country,
O my dear Ukraine:
Why, my mother, have they robbed you?
Why do you thus wane?

These words were directed against the Russians; Shevchenko spared no love for them. He cried out to his countrymen:

Arise! Sundering your chains,
Bless your freedom with the blood
Of foemen's evil veins!

Because Taras Shevchenko is so highly esteemed by all Ukrainians, even the Russians could not nullify him in their policy of Russification of Ukraine. Therefore, they took a more sophisticated approach. Instead of declaring Shevchenko an "enemy of the people," as Nicholas I once did, the Soviets have tried to incorporate him into their own ideology. Let the Ukrainians venerate Shevchenko—but not as the symbol of Ukrainian national self-determination; rather, as the representative of the Communist creed. Only the naive have the Soviets been successful in their fallacious attempts. Taras Shevchenko remains and will remain a national hero to the Ukrainian people and not a forerunner of Communist ideology.

Shevchenko's entire life was one of hardship and strife. A serf for 24 years, he enjoyed only 9 years of freedom before he was imprisoned and exiled under Czarist decree. More than a century after his death, Shevchenko is still troubled, still cast about as a political pawn. He knows no peace, no happy release from his struggle.

Shevchenko is the Ukrainian spirit. He is dedication; he is obstinate perseverance. He will not and cannot know rest until one day his land, his beloved Ukraine will be free again.

Till from Ukraine to the blue sea
It [river Dniipro] bears in fierce endeavor
The blood of foemen—then I'll leave
Wheatland and hills forever;
Leave all behind, soar up until
Before the throne of God
I'll make my prayer. For till that hour
I shall know naught of God.

"THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION—TEACHING THE BILL OF RIGHTS"

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the heritage of our Nation is strongly imbued with the rights and freedoms of individual man. Our Founding Fathers envisioned government as the creation of free men—an entity to serve them but not to stifle or smother their most fundamental liberties. Today the rhetoric remains strong. The deep commitment in actual practice, however, is lacking.

In 1961, the Constitutional Rights Foundation was founded in Los Angeles, Calif., as an independent, tax-exempt, nonprofit corporation to promote educational programs aimed at deepening our understanding of and allegiance to the principles of freedom, justice, and equality defined in the Bill of Rights. The invaluable job being done by the Constitutional Rights Foundation—and the extent of the need—is described in two articles which at this time I want to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with unanimous consent. The first, "Teaching the Bill of Rights in California" appeared in the March 19, 1966, issue of Saturday Review and is written by the editor of the California Teachers Association Journal. The other is written by Mrs. DeAnne Sobul, an educational consultant to the CRF, and a former high school teacher. Entitled "Education for Freedom," Mrs. Sobul's article first appeared in the December 1966 edition of the California Journal for Instructional Improvement.

I highly recommend these articles—the authors familiarize us well with this project and the Foundation which deserves so much encouragement and support.

The articles follow:

EDUCATION FOR FREEDOM (DeAnne F. Sobul)

Recent studies of the values and attitudes of adolescents suggest that education relating to the basic principles of American life embodied in the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights¹ has been seriously deficient. Instruction concerned with individual freedom and responsibility in general has taken the form of non-critical enumeration, without any attempt to explore or discuss the controversial issues raised by conflicts between asserted individual liberties and the needs of society. The results of that educational deficiency have been serious. Studies show that public attachment to fundamental rights exists only on the most superficial verbal level. Such research re-

¹ The "Bill of Rights" as used in the article pertains to the concept of an expanded Bill of Rights. That is, all Amendments which protect individual rights and liberties such as those contained in amendments Thirteen, Fourteen, Fifteen and Nineteen—not merely the first ten Amendments of the Constitution.

veals that today's youth are more willing to tolerate unauthorized searches of private dwellings, the suppression of the rights of minorities, and the discharge from public employment of persons suspected of subversive activities than were the adolescents of ten years ago. A large percentage of a representative student sample condones the use of "third degree" police methods to obtain confessions, the denial of the right to vote to persons with "wild ideas," and residential and religious segregation.²

(NOTE.—Mrs. Sobul was one of a staff of six who prepared the manuscript for *The Bill of Rights—A Source Book for Teachers* for the California State Department of Education. She is presently Educational Consultant, Constitutional Rights Foundation, Los Angeles and on leave from the Los Angeles Unified School District where she was a Curriculum Consultant and a social studies teacher at University High School.)

Even more serious is the character of public debate on issues raised by the Bill of Rights. This debate has been marked by an almost total lack of communication between those with opposing views. Great disparity exists between general, and in some quarters almost hysterical support of basic American ideals, especially the Bill of Rights, and how these ideals are implemented in practice. One has only to look at the recent record of events to find evidence of this breakdown in communication: student demonstrations and protests at many universities and colleges throughout the United States; howling and even violent white mobs in Chicago and Grenada; riots and destruction in the Negro ghettos of Los Angeles, San Francisco, Cleveland, Dayton, and Atlanta; totally emotional reactions to Supreme Court decisions; the movement of some groups to engender support for the impeachment of the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Evidence of this breakdown in communication is not only apparent in the adult community but is becoming increasingly obvious in the secondary schools of some communities. Witness the emotional response without the mediating influence of dialogue which is aroused over such issues as censoring the school newspaper, extending invitations to individuals to speak on controversial topics, or dressing suitably.

Evidence of a willingness to deny others rights, long regarded as basic American freedoms, and of the inability to rationally discuss issues fundamental to the Bill of Rights indicate a failure in educating the young concerning the responsibilities, the privileges, and the personal demands of freedom. The duty of improving American citizenship cannot rest solely with those who teach. Other groups, as the family, church, parent groups, communications media, and public officials also have substantial responsibilities which must be assumed. The educational community, however, must accept the major responsibility and must recognize that it has the main opportunity to increase the aware-

ness, sensitivity, and civic interest of future citizens.

Fortunately in California the task is begun. In 1963, the Constitutional Rights Foundation persuaded the California State Board of Education to issue a policy statement calling for improved teaching of Bill of Rights principles in California schools. In order to implement this policy the Board requested that the State Department of Education investigate the treatment and coverage of Bill of Rights issues in textbooks and curriculum materials used in California schools. The report, "The United States Bill of Rights in California Education," by John G. Church, Curriculum Consultant, California State Department of Education, revealed that textbooks and other materials, including curriculum guides for teachers, were woefully inadequate. The Board of Education then established an Advisory Panel on Teaching About the Bill of Rights to make suggestions as to how this problem might be solved.

The first specific project to implement Board of Education policy is now completed. Financed by a \$30,000 grant from the Constitutional Rights Foundation, *The Bill of Rights—A Source Book for Teachers* will soon be available for distribution to every senior high school teacher of American History, United States Government and problems of democracy. It will also be available on a limited basis to teachers in junior high schools and in elementary schools.

Originally the goal of the publication was to develop a curriculum guide on teaching the Bill of Rights. However, it was soon found that such an approach might lead to sermonizing and thus to indoctrination rather than result in an informed discussion of the application of Constitutional guarantees. Consequently, the final product is very different from most curriculum guides with which teachers are familiar. *The Bill of Rights—A Source Book for Teachers* is exactly that, a source book. It contains many materials from which the teacher can draw in preparing effective lessons relating to Bill of Rights principles in a variety of social studies courses. It includes a compilation of the historical origins and development of the Bill of Rights. It employs the present problems created by the application of the guarantees embodied in these Constitutional provisions.

Time and space limitations necessitated selection, not only of areas of inquiry, but also of whole provisions of the Bill of Rights as well. Not included, for example, are the Second, Third, Ninth, and Tenth amendments. Nor was there an attempt to compile an exhaustive historical or topical treatment. The philosophy of the publication is that effective teaching of the Bill of Rights requires a functional presentation and not a numerical, nondiscriminating catalog.

The mere distribution of this publication, regardless of its worthiness, is not enough to solve the problem discussed above. It is only step one in what must become a massive effort to teach the principles and concepts which underlie Constitutional rights and liberties so that all youth will: recognize the significance of the Bill of Rights; realize the Bill of Rights is a dynamic document and is a vital aspect of everyday American life; demonstrate an awareness that all Americans are entitled to freedom, justice, and equality; participate rationally in the dialogue relating to Bill of Rights issues; demonstrate an appreciation for the views of others by encouraging dissenters to speak openly; and deal with the problem of the unanswered question in a rational, intelligent, and communicative way.

Changed student behavior resulting from teacher use of the Source Book is dependent upon teacher ability to use the publication. While the Source Book contains many teacher aids, an intensive in-service training experience for most American History, United

States Government, and problems of democracy teachers is essential if student behavior relating to Bill of Rights issues is to be changed.

Seven teacher workshops were held at colleges and universities throughout California during the past summer. The primary aim of these workshops was to acquaint eleventh and twelfth grade teachers with the substance and suggested teaching strategies contained in the Source Book. The workshops involved approximately 350 teachers and were entirely self-supporting except for a \$2400 grant provided by the State Department of Education from funds obtained under Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Additionally, the Riverside Unified School District and the El Monte Union High School District involved their eleventh and twelfth grade social studies teachers in a four-week experimental workshop. In El Monte almost all eleventh and twelfth grade social studies teachers from each of the three high schools participated. In Riverside both junior and senior high school social studies teachers participated; consequently, it will be more difficult to measure the effect of the workshop experience. Thus, the participants were undoubtedly representative of social studies teachers throughout California. Each workshop was structured to allow for instruction by law professors in the substance of the Source Book and for preparation of classroom materials. The El Monte and Riverside workshops were jointly financed by the State Department of Education (Title V of E.S.E.A. funds), the Constitutional Rights Foundation, and the local school district.

The results of these two district-wide workshops have encouraged other school districts to plan in-service training programs aimed at implementing the Source Book within their curriculum objectives and structure. If the Source Book is to be an effective tool for the average teacher, every school district in California must develop programs to develop teacher insights and techniques which will enliven his classroom so that the Bill of Rights becomes a dynamic, vital aspect of the lives of his students. Teachers must be provided with every opportunity to gain insights and to acquire information which will enable them to reassess old teaching strategies. Only in this way can teacher behavior be changed to influence student behavior.

Publication of the Source Book, even in the tentative edition last spring, occasioned teacher demands for student materials in support of the approach taken in the publication. In May, 1966, Thomas Braden, President of the State Board of Education, Dean Richard Maxwell, Chairman of the Advisory Panel on the Bill of Rights, and Burt Lancaster, Chairman of the Advisory Panel's Subcommittee on Audio-Visual Aids, called a meeting of textbook publishers and educational film producers. Master teachers and curriculum experts were invited to testify as to the coverage and availability of instructional materials relating to Bill of Rights issues. The conclusion of these experts was that present student materials do little to acquaint the student with the past or present problems created by the application of the guarantees embodied in the Constitution.

Publisher and producer response to this meeting was overwhelming. More than one hundred representatives attended and appeared to accept the challenge to improve existing materials and to create new ones.

The publication of the Source Book has been widely applauded by citizen groups, the communications media, members of the law profession, educators and teachers who have read and used it. But its impact on the classroom has not yet been felt. Will the average social studies teacher find the time to select portions from the Source Book that will help him plan truly effective lessons on Bill of Rights principles? The answer to

²See for example: Civil Liberties Educational Foundation, Inc., *A Report on the Current Status of Bill of Rights-Civil Liberties Teaching in Secondary Schools*. New York: Civil Liberties Educational Foundation, 1962 (Mimeo). Drucker, A. J., and Remmers, H. H., "Citizenship Attitudes of Graduated Seniors at Purdue University, United States College Graduates and High School Pupils." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1951. Frymier, J. R., "Analysis of Adolescents' Responses to F-scale." *Journal of Experimental Education*, 1960. Remmers, H. H., and Franklin, R. D., "Sweet Land of Liberty." *Phi Delta Kappan*, January, 1962. *Youth Looks at Civil Liberties and the 1960 Election*. Report of Poll No. 61 of the Purdue Opinion Panel. Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, 1960 (Mimeo).

this question carries many implications for local school districts in their implementation of the publication within their curriculum objectives and structure. Few teachers can do this alone; a concerted effort to explore the *Source Book's* use and to develop student materials must be made in every school district.

Through the publication of the *Source Book*, the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education have required the teacher to immerse himself and his class in controversy. Topics such as civil disobedience, prayers in the public schools, fair housing legislation, de facto segregation and law enforcement methods must be discussed fairly in the social studies classroom if the approach of the *Source Book* is to be implemented. However, what happens to the teacher who does discuss such issues and receives community criticism but no administrative support? Most teachers have long been reluctant to allow free and open discussion of controversial issues and as a consequence have become silent and didactic in their approach to Bill of Rights issues. Although the *Source Book* does provide insight, information, and techniques for handling such issues in the classroom, no teacher is willing to become a target for those who wish only their point of view taught without being assured of his local district's administrative and Board support.

The aspirations of the *Source Book* are great indeed. Simply put, they are to make high school students aware of their heritage and of the present political imperative that the values of the Bill of Rights be maintained not as interesting historical concepts but as vital, dynamic principles of living. Even partial fulfillment of these aspirations depends upon local school district acceptance of leadership in establishing programs which will implement the *Source Book*. Local districts must accept this responsibility to educate all their youth, not just the brightest, to become effective, participating citizens who are aware of the responsibilities, the privileges, and the personal demands of freedom.

TEACHING THE BILL OF RIGHTS IN CALIFORNIA

(NOTE.—The American people are devoted to their Constitution and to the individual rights it guarantees, but they have repeatedly demonstrated their difficulty in translating the broad principles of freedom into action in specific cases. The problem, almost invariably, is ignorance of the practical, everyday meaning of these principles. To make sure that future generations are better informed about their rights and responsibilities as Americans, the Constitutional Rights Foundation (605 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif., 90017) is cooperating with public education agencies in California to improve teaching about the Bill of Rights in the state's schools. The foundation is a non-profit organization made up of public-spirited educators, lawyers, businessmen, labor leaders, and motion picture personalities. The state-wide program it is sparking is described here by the editor of the *California Teachers Association Journal*.)

(By J. Wilson McKenney)

One out of four U.S. high school seniors believes that "the government should prohibit some people from making public speeches." Sixty-three per cent of these graduating teenagers would not allow Communists to speak on the radio in peacetime, and 42 per cent agree that the police or the FBI may sometimes be right in giving a man "the third degree" in order to make him talk.

These are the findings of H. H. Remmers and his associates at the Purdue University Division of Educational Reference. Since 1951 they have tested repeatedly the attitudes of young U.S. citizens, and have concluded that these young people display an

appalling lack of comprehension of the content and meaning of the Bill of Rights.

But failure to understand that liberty is indivisible is far more widespread. Many Americans who recently tested their own elementary knowledge of the Bill of Rights by participating in the Columbia Broadcasting System's "National Citizenship Test," demonstrated that ignorance is not limited to the young (see end of article). The evidence indicates clearly that Americans are fervently attached to the concept of freedom—in many ways they have fought bravely in its defense. Yet, too often, their understanding of the practice of freedom has been as superficial as the war-time slogans for which they fought. Young and old, they are largely ignorant of the basic charter of their freedom and, in practice, are often oblivious to—even approving of—its violation in specific, emotion-laden instances.

In California, however, something tangible is being done about this gap between principle and practice. The State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, and the Constitutional Rights Foundation (CRF), have combined forces to see that future generations of high school graduates are better educated concerning their freedoms, their liberties, their rights and responsibilities as citizens, through better teaching of the Bill of Rights.

California's attack on ignorance of the principles of individual freedom was launched in 1963 when CRF representatives persuaded the State Board of Education to look into the nature and extent of teaching about constitutional rights in the schools of the state. It was found that a few school districts had prepared resource materials for their teachers, but the record was spotty, and no comprehensive approach to the subject had been developed.

As a result, the Board prepared a policy statement that strongly endorsed teaching about the Bill of Rights in the schools and called for improved instruction in the field. Methodist Bishop Gerald Kennedy of Los Angeles was appointed chairman of a four-man committee of members of the Board charged with responsibility for seeing that the policy was implemented, and a fourteen-man advisory committee of attorneys, educators, and civil leaders, headed by Richard C. Maxwell, Dean of the School of Law at the University of California at Los Angeles, was appointed to aid the committee.

The immediate need, the Board decided, was for a teachers curriculum guide for use within the existing social studies program in the last two years of high school. With a \$30,000 grant from CRF, State Superintendent of Schools Max Rafferty set up a Department of Education project to develop a guide that would provide tangible aid to teachers in treating the subject in greater depth. This guide, the *Bill of Rights Source Book* for teachers of American history and government, is now being published and will be distributed to eleventh- and twelfth-grade teachers throughout the state. It presents applications of the Bill of Rights to current controversies—from school segregation and sit-ins to school prayer and released time—with legal and historical background. The *Source Book* does not aim at developing a particular point of view, but at stimulating an informative dialogue among those with differing points of view.

While the guide was in preparation, CRF launched, in 1964, the first of an annual series of Bill of Rights Teachers Contests to encourage more secondary school teachers to venture into the field. Modest cash prizes and state-wide recognition are offered to teachers who have developed effective classroom approaches to constitutional liberties.

Among the first year's contest winners, the direct approach appeared to be most popular. For instance, Gregory L. Goodwin, a Bakersfield American history teacher

reported how he had presented to his classes "a petition to insure personal liberties."

He wrote at the top of a sheet, "We the undersigned, urge that the following points of personal liberty be considered legal and binding upon the government of the United States of America. If necessary, they should be added to the Constitution in the form of Amendments." He then listed seven brief statements which, with minor word changes, accurately identified seven provisions in the Bill of Rights.

Few of his students volunteered to sign the paper, and even fewer recognized that the petition had been drawn from the Constitution. He then asked his students to offer petitions to a few neighbors and relatives. Only one-fourth of the adults recognized the source of the wording. Goodwin used this shocking demonstration of ignorance as an effective introduction to case studies of the application of the Bill of Rights to specific individual liberties.

Even more realistic was the first-prize entry submitted by Joyce Fulton, history teacher at Woodside High School, San Mateo county. Convinced that the increased concern for Bill of Rights protections in recent years has been the result of the dramatic exposure by Negroes of the freedom gap between principle and practice in America, Miss Fulton used as the core of her study "The Due Processing of Asbury Howard," an article by Jeffrey Fuller, which appeared in *The Reporter* of April 16, 1959. Fuller's account tells of the arrest, courtroom "trial," and subsequent courthouse beating of the Alabama Negro by angry whites. Howard had committed the "crime" of ordering, for a voter registration drive, the drawing of a poster showing a chained Negro in prayer.

Miss Fulton took her students step by step through the gripping, tragic story of Howard's experience to enable them to understand the practical applications of due process, search and seizure, and Fourteenth Amendment protections. She plunged her students into vigorous discussion of human rights and liberties to illustrate the complexities of Supreme Court interpretations in relation to state laws. And after using these methods for two years she had ample evidence that this realistic case study approach had helped her students to understand better the true meaning of the Bill of Rights.

Few teachers, however, are as imaginative or as informed as Miss Fulton and Mr. Goodwin, and the problems of presenting the subject in the classroom are many. As Miss Fulton pointed out, when she was invited to speak before the State Board of Education last June, there are numerous barriers to good teaching and learning in the field. The complexity of the issues (often stumping well-trained lawyers), the necessity of obtaining and using pertinent and current materials, and the difficulty of translating fast-changing policies and events into appropriate study units, all present obstacles that must be overcome.

Furthermore: "To teach the Bill of Rights meaningfully," she said, "the teacher must make a conscious choice, immersing himself and his class in controversy. The teacher becomes a target for critical parents—and many teachers are understandably reluctant to open up Pandora's box."

"Discussing the Bill of Rights with highly verbal students who enjoy a clash of beliefs is stimulating and challenging," she continued, "but the young people we must be concerned with are the vast majority of average or remedial students who leave high school—and they couldn't care less about interpretations of law by the courts. Hundreds of students are marching into society with little true understanding of the tolerance they must have if freedom of the individual is to prevail."

In order to meet these and related prob-

lems in classroom presentation, CRF is co-operating with educational agencies in sponsoring a variety of programs. In co-operation with the State Department of Education and a number of colleges and universities, CRF has sponsored, since 1964, a series of summer workshops for teachers interested in improving their teaching of the Bill of Rights. During the summer of 1966 workshops will be held at UCLA, Humboldt State College, San Diego State, San Fernando Valley State, and the California State Colleges at Hayward and Los Angeles.

As soon as adequate financing is secured, another effort to develop effective teaching material and procedures, and to identify the best means for introducing them into all high schools in the state, will be launched. The new *Bill of Rights Sources Book* will be thoroughly tested in two representative school districts during the next two years. In El Monte and in Riverside high schools all social studies teachers will participate in a pilot program supervised by CRF staff members and consultants. Not only will the guide itself be refined and improved, but new methods for training teachers and techniques for introducing the subject in the classroom will be developed.

To help provide better community understanding for teachers who raise controversial issues about individual rights in the classroom, the California Teachers Association and the State Board of Education are co-operating with CRF in sponsoring a series of conferences and institutes for teachers, administrators, and community leaders. The objective is greater public and professional awareness of the importance of such teaching, and increased understanding and support by the public generally.

Finally, to help make sure that more children in the state are exposed to teaching about the Bill of Rights and its meaning for contemporary life, CRF is joining with education agencies in sponsoring two programs. The first is a cooperative effort of the State Department of Education and the CRF staff and consultants to develop a Bill of Rights teaching program at the elementary school level. The State Department of Education has just received financing from the U.S. Office of Education for exploratory work on this project. The second project, in cooperation with the Los Angeles Public Schools and the National Urban League, provides weekend programs in a camp environment for students from six senior high schools in the curfew area of Los Angeles created during the "Watts riots" of last summer. These young people from one of the city's most depressed areas are introduced to the rights and the responsibilities that are theirs under the Bill of Rights. Both students and teachers, in a relaxed environment, have an opportunity to work out means of communication that will enhance effective presentations in the classroom. Financing for this project has been received from the Fund for the Advancement of Education.

California is not alone of course, in recognizing the necessity for effective teaching about constitutional liberties. During the past year bar associations in New York, Wisconsin, and Illinois, as well as California, set up active committees to encourage lawyers to serve as lecturers on the Bill of Rights in public schools. The New York City schools have begun to introduce a program on concepts of civil rights and liberties. And Columbia University has just announced a new Center for Research and Education in American Liberties.

California's experiment, however, has moved farther than most toward effective teaching in this area. It is unique because it is not being developed in one school district or one university or college, but is the result of the cooperative effort of members of the State Board of Education, university and college educators, classroom teachers, lawyers, and community leaders. If present plans are brought to fruition, it is even pos-

sible that the First, the Fifth, and the Fourteenth may become as familiar to California's future generations of high school graduates as space flights, folk singing, and sports cars. And if the movement spreads, it will be good for the whole country.

No student should leave our schools without a lively knowledge of the American Constitution, for here are found the main principles of our heritage. Our democracy can be kept strong only by the dedication of every new generation to the discipline of liberty. In knowledge of the Bill of Rights and in loyalty to its propositions rests our faith in the future.

We believe the teaching in this field, no matter how controversial the issue, should be conducted within the framework of free discussion. Not only the history of the Bill of Rights should be taught, but contemporary issues it raises, such as the debate over separation of church and state embodied in the First Amendment, and the privilege against self-incrimination as provided in the Fifth Amendment, should be discussed. Now is the time to help our young people to become aware of the risks, the privileges, and the personal demands of freedom.

We urge all school superintendents to give this subject the highest priority. We hope that the very conduct of the classes studying the Bill of Rights will reflect its spirit and be a demonstration of civil rights in action.—(Excerpt from Policy Statement, California State Board of Education.)

FINDINGS OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP TEST

Last November, CBS News broadcast a National Citizenship Test during which viewers were asked to answer forty-two questions on their rights, obligations, and responsibilities as U.S. citizens.

The test was drawn up by CBS with the aid of lawyers, police, professors, and educators. The Opinion Research Corporation helped administer the test, prior to the broadcast, to a representative cross section of the American adult population. Their average scores for the whole test are given below—a perfect score is 100; the lowest passing score is 60. Significantly, scores went up with the educational level.

Average nationwide score, 63; 5 per cent, 86 or higher; 14 per cent, 76-85; 47 per cent, 60-75; 34 per cent, below 60.

Four special groups of citizens were also tested. Their average scores:

Congressmen and wives, 85; Political workers in Philadelphia, 83; High school honor students in St. Louis, 83; League of Women Voters in New York, 72.

POST OFFICE PROBLEMS ARE OUTLINED IN NATIONAL MAGAZINE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the March issue of *Fortune* magazine touches upon the bewildering range of problems in our overburdened postal system in an excellent article entitled "It's Now or Never for the Post Office."

As Congressmen, we are concerned about the perpetual problem of just keeping up with the growing mail load. This article reviews those problems and points out the steps being planned for modernization to improve service.

I bring this excellent article to the attention of all Members of the House, as follows:

[From *Fortune*, March 1967]

IT'S NOW OR NEVER FOR THE POST OFFICE—TIME IS RUNNING OUT AND TROUBLE IS SPREADING

Not long ago, a harassed Post Office official looking at figures on rising volume and falling efficiency gloomily concluded that by the year 2000 every man, woman, and ambulant child in the U.S. will be delivering the mail. More sophisticated postal planners, slightly embarrassed, scoff at such speculation. But the pessimistic bureaucrat is essentially right: unless something is done soon to reform the service, the postal system is headed for an impossible situation.

Warnings like this are nothing new. This time, though, the wolf really is coming. Until recently, the creaky old Post Office has managed to struggle along more or less abreast of increasing volume—usually by adding to a work force that now numbers 700,000. The traditional remedy of adding workers, however, has only piled up the costs and helped to produce chaos in the system. Wages have increased far more than productivity, and postal rates have lagged. Meanwhile the deficit has soared and service has deteriorated. Mail users who once could take reliable and reasonably prompt service for granted are no longer so sure of either. Be-leaguered officials, always preoccupied with the problems of the moment, never have managed to look ahead or to build into the system the added capacity sure to be needed. In the past two years, to their consternation, mail volume has risen at almost double the normal 3 percent annual rate. In December, in fact, it was up 9 percent from December, 1965. Qualified workers to handle the load, even if there were money to pay them and room to put them to work in the antiquated plant, are simply not available to the Post Office in today's labor-short economy. And that oft-talked-about mechanization program is barely under way.

Last October a mail jam in Chicago demonstrated the sobering fact that the U.S. mail system can break down. For three weeks the biggest post office building in the world was choked with ten million pieces of mail while shaken Washington officials diverted much of the mail normally processed there to other cities. Some of the causes of the debacle were peculiar to the Chicago operation. But the basic problems—an outmoded facility, too little mechanization, and a shortage of skilled workers—are common to the majority of big-city post offices. "The Chicago experience was a warning," declares a congressional expert on postal affairs. "The same thing can happen almost anywhere if we don't take action."

Fortunately, there are hopeful signs that action will be taken. Perhaps the most important indication is found in the performance over the past sixteen months of Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, forty-nine. To the surprise of just about everyone connected with the postal service—and to the gratification of most of them—O'Brien is turning out to be the strongest, most imaginative boss the department has ever had. This is somewhat ironic in view of the vague popular notion that the Post Office should be run "like a business"; O'Brien regards himself as "just a politician." The plain fact, however, is that the Post Office is like no business on earth. It is, and forever will remain, a political institution—one in which authority and responsibility are peculiarly divided between the executive and the legislative branches of the government. Only a consummate politician with the connections and the "clout" of a Larry O'Brien can ever hope to get the broad support needed for the rejuvenation of the postal system. An original member of the Kennedy "Irish Mafia," O'Brien was one of the key managers of the 1960 campaign. He then served as a White House aide to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and now has greater access to the President than any Postmaster

General since James A. Farley. And after six years as White House liaison man with Congress, O'Brien is the best-liked and most familiar Administration figure on Capitol Hill.

When President Johnson decided to elevate O'Brien to the Cabinet rather than lose his services, it is unlikely either man fully realized how "right" the appointment was. In Washington the impression got around that O'Brien would do little more than occupy the Postmaster General's baronial office while he continued to perform as political strategist and legislative missionary. It didn't take him long, however, to learn he had inherited a postal mess. A proud and competitive man, O'Brien resolved he would not permit his reputation for accomplishment to be tarnished without putting up a fierce battle. He came to the fray well equipped, bringing the analytical mind and the organizational skill that marked his previous electoral efforts, plus a thick skin and a touch of Irish temper. Though he still acts as L.B.J.'s chief legislative adviser and handles important political chores, there is no longer any doubt in the Post Office. O'Brien is running the show.

As the Postmaster General, he is demonstrating not only unusual energy but also a flair for modern management practices. Last year he created the department's first Office of Planning and upgraded the small and unproductive Office of Research and Engineering to the more prestigious status of a bureau, bringing in dozens of highly qualified outsiders to run them. Overriding his cautious engineers, he launched a \$100-million crash mechanization program—including a computer center, which eventually will keep track of mail flow and manpower use in the seventy-five largest post offices. He has also embarked on a program to provide the Post Office with professional management by recruiting 250 college graduates over the next five years, and is seeking funds for a postal academy to train other executives in modern mail techniques. Finally, O'Brien has expanded efforts to secure the active cooperation of large mailers—persuading them to plan their mailings to make the postal job easier and to perform themselves many operations (see box, opposite) that once were dumped onto the mail system.

It's not a moment too soon. Last year O'Brien's deputy reluctantly conceded to a congressional committee that service was worse than in 1956. "In all candor," the Postmaster General now admits, "I cannot say that mail service is adequate." Rare is the mail user who cannot recount an unforgivable delay: and air-mail special-delivery packet that takes eight days to travel from New York to Washington or a first-class letter that spends five days crossing Manhattan. (Photographs of two high-ranking Post Office officials, intended for use in this article, vanished in the mails and the pictures had to be retaken.) Though postal officials protest defensively that the number of complaints is modest compared with the volume of mail handled, they ignore the strong probability that most dissatisfied customers do not bother to lodge formal complaints.

METHODS DEFEAT THE SYSTEM

Considering the state of the department's facilities, personnel, and management—and the limitations under which the system is required to operate—it would be miraculous if the service were first class. Mail volume in fiscal 1967 is expected to reach 80 billion pieces—more than all the mail handled by all other postal services in the world. Even by the Post Office staff's conservative estimates, the volume will rise 18 percent more by 1972. If the rate of increase of the past two years should continue, the figure could be as high as 35 percent. Yet the work of handling the mail is being performed today with much the same facilities that existed before World War II, when only one-third as much mail was processed. Almost all of the

seventy-five largest post offices, which process 50 percent of the mail, were built near railroad stations at a time when 10,000 trains a day hauled the bulk of the mail. Now, with only 900 trains in daily use, the movement of mail depends heavily on trucks that must move to and from depots in the heart of traffic-choked cities. Few post offices can be adequately mechanized; floors are too weak to support heavy machinery, ceilings are too low for overhead conveyor systems, layouts are impossible to adapt to efficient mail-flow systems.

Most of today's mail, therefore, is collected, processed, and delivered by the same methods employed a century ago. Even in a post office as important as Chicago's, throngs of clerks still perch before pigeonhole cases, laboriously sorting individual letters by hand at the rate of about thirty a minute. For letters without a zip-code number, clerks must remember thousands of routing "schemes" for towns all over the country. And this process, in one form or another, is repeated an average of six times as the letter or parcel travels from the sender to the addressee. So great is the human effort involved that 81 percent of the Post Office's current budget of \$6.3 billion goes to pay workers.

The department's 700,000 employees, one of every four on the federal civilian payroll, work in an atmosphere of frustration that is ruinous to morale. Their duties, demanding but dull, must be performed largely at unappealing hours: clerks labor through the night to process the mail; carriers must report before dawn to prepare for their morning rounds. Pay is poor at all levels despite a 25 percent average increase since 1962; beginning bus drivers in many cities earn \$100 a month more than postal recruits. Opportunities for advancement are almost nil. Some 85 percent of all postal workers are crowded into the bottom four grades—with a pay ceiling, even after twenty-one years, of \$7,267. The typical carrier or clerk is maddeningly aware that he will retire with the same rank. It's not surprising, then, that many employees are touchy and brusque with the public, resentful of criticism and antagonistic toward their superiors—or that they react as quickly and violently as they do to any real or imagined threat to the security that is the main attraction of their jobs.

In prosperous times, security is not attraction enough. In many areas across the country—San Francisco and the Chicago suburbs are two—the Post Office literally cannot find qualified people. When it can hire people, more often than not they are soon gone. Post Office turnover has jumped from a prewar 13 percent to a current 21 percent. Last year the department had to take on 180,000 employees to fill 80,000 new jobs. The decline in the caliber of personnel is evident in many large post offices. Thirty years ago the service was a haven for many highly educated men who could not find jobs elsewhere, especially Negro college graduates, who came to the Post Office in droves. Today postal recruits are still disproportionately Negro. But employment bars have come down in private industry and other government agencies, leaving the Post Office to forage among those with lesser skills. Many heavy jobs once done by men are now performed, unsatisfactorily, by women. Senator Daniel B. Brewster, Maryland Democrat and member of the Senate Post Office committee, charges that the department has become a "dumping ground" for persons otherwise unemployed.

This growing work force is anything but tractable. A breakdown in discipline is blamed by congressional postal experts for part of the trouble in the Chicago post office. O'Brien has taken public note of disciplinary problems elsewhere. Part of the problem is that some 92 percent of all postal workers are members of fourteen labor unions that are militant, competitive, jealous of their

jurisdictions, and resistant to change. President Kennedy granted them formal recognition, and now the Post Office is carved up into 24,400 different bargaining units. When the unions cannot win a point across the table, they sometimes go over the heads of department executives to Congress.

UNIONS RETARD INNOVATION

The union leaders declare publicly they have no fear of mechanization, but they manage to find fault with almost every device the Post Office installs. Some claim that new mechanical letter sorters, which compel operators to keep up with their sixty-a-minute pace, are too nerve-racking and fatiguing. Others assail the three-wheeled "mailsters" used by residential letter carriers as a threat to mailmen's lives. They fire public broadsides against the zip code, which is central to all future mechanization plans. "Our unions don't hesitate to criticize our programs for their own personal reasons," complains an indignant assistant postmaster general.

The picture is hardly any better at the supervisory level. Until recently, promotions depended to a considerable degree on political influence. There was—and is—nothing automatic about the rise to the top of the best-qualified candidate. When a man with superior abilities does advance, he may well discover more frustration than satisfaction. Hemmed in by hundreds of petty regulations, and caught between a politically appointed postmaster and frequently belligerent subordinates, he is asked to do his job without any real training in management techniques. Last year Congress rejected a request for \$2 million to teach inexperienced supervisors and local postmasters procedures for negotiating labor contracts and handling employee grievances.

Many supervisors, moreover, find it difficult to shift their loyalties from the work force, in which they have usually spent long years, to the department. Nearly all belong to the 30,400-member National Association of Postal Supervisors, now demanding contract negotiations with the very management of which they are a part. The whole set of relationships is so bad that O'Brien last year felt it necessary to complain publicly about "supervisors who, in an effort to maintain their own popularity, make a habit of deprecating, in the presence of employees under their supervision, programs they feel might be unpopular. I consider this kind of behavior unmanly, disloyal, and an insult to the postal service."

Just above the supervisors are 33,000 postmasters—every one of them chosen subject to the veto of a Congressman or local political chieftain. O'Brien insists that the problem of political patronage in the Post Office is much exaggerated. His view, however, may well be colored by his special relations with Congress. An excellent argument can be made that the inbred postal system needs an occasional infusion of outsiders, but the overwhelming majority of noncareer men appointed to postmasterships are receiving rewards for political service rather than being picked on their merit as managers, their professional qualifications, or their interest in improving the service. It is encouraging that in the O'Brien regime more career men have been promoted to important postmasterships and that Chairman Mike Monroney of the Senate Post Office committee has introduced legislation to eliminate political approval of all postmasters.

Finally, things are far from perfect in the department's headquarters. The atmosphere there is largely a compound of the defensiveness of men who have taken too many unfair beatings from Congress and the public, and the cynicism bound to infect people who have watched too many confident Postmasters General finally accept defeat. O'Brien shies away from discussing it, but a friend says he was appalled in his early days on the job by the staff's apathetic attitudes.

Now, this man adds, "he at least has them convinced that they should stick around until their desks are clear."

Given the intensely conservative attitude of the department's personnel at all levels, making the revolutionary changes needed would be a strenuous task for top postal leaders under any circumstances. The job is made doubly difficult by the restraints under which they operate. Congress, although it is quick to fault postal service, steadfastly refuses to give up any of its tight control in the interest of efficiency. Congress defines the services of the Post Office and the conditions under which they must be performed. Congress sets the postal rates. Congress fixes the size of the postal work force and establishes the pay scales—frequently with little regard to revenues. And Congress doles out every dime of the department's funds—under terms frankly designed to make certain that they are spent in an inflexible manner.

To make matters worse, the real decisions on these matters are made not by the entire Congress, which regards postal problems as totally lacking in political sex appeal, but by four separate committees of the House and Senate. Two must legislate, two must appropriate money—and the coordination of views and intentions among the four sometimes leaves a great deal to be desired.

At that, the Congressmen have often shown themselves to be more progressive than the department's professional management. Only after persistent urging by members of a House appropriations subcommittee did the department establish an Office of Research and Engineering in 1956. Congressmen were ahead of postal officials in taking a look at Europe's postal systems for new ideas. Nevertheless it seems clear that, on balance, Congress holds too tight a rein on the Post Office, and the influence has not always been benevolent.

The inevitable result of this irrational system is inefficiency and a chronic disparity in revenues and costs. The official postal deficit in the current fiscal year is estimated at \$637 million.* Given the immutable political realities, it seems unlikely that any Postmaster General will ever completely close the gap. O'Brien recognizes the need to try, and over the long haul he hopes that modernization of postal methods will make it possible for the department to cut the deficit drastically. But to balance the books right now, he is proposing to Congress a \$700-million boost in mail rates—1 cent on first-class mail and air mail and 20 to 30 percent on second-class and third-class mail. The request is sure to touch off a furious fight, however, and there is no guarantee O'Brien will get his way.

TIME TO STOP PLAYING FIREMAN

So much of what is wrong with the Post Office is so obvious that it is difficult to understand why most of O'Brien's moves were not undertaken years ago by his predecessors. Some tried. Arthur E. Summerfield initiated the regional administrative organization that relieves the Postmaster General of the burden of dealing with the petty problems of 33,000 individual postmasters. J. Edward Day introduced the zip code—the most important single innova-

tion in decades. John A. Gronouski, now U.S. Ambassador to Poland, pushed through regulations making second-class and third-class mailers zip-code and presort mail. But nobody before O'Brien really put together a comprehensive attack on the department's problems. And nobody before O'Brien brought to the job the forward-looking approach that is routine in any well-run business. The present postal boss is quick to defend those who held the job before him. "Every guy who sat here just tried to keep his head above water," he explains. "A crisis around here can be a Congressman who wants some guy in a third-class post office to get some more money. The question is, can we get out of the role of fireman and take some steps in planning?"

O'Brien has already taken two important steps in this direction by establishing the Office of Planning under the direction of Ronald B. Lee, thirty-four, and by turning the Office of Research and Engineering into a bureau headed by an assistant postmaster general. To fill this critically important post, O'Brien outbid the Pentagon for the services of Dr. Leo S. Packer, forty-six, a former engineering manager of Xerox Corp. Lee, a West Point graduate ('54) and former White House fellow, commands a small band of highly qualified analysts who will suggest, coordinate, and criticize specific planning projects for the department's six bureaus and will use their own expertise on more general studies. His function, Lee explains, is to "ask the primary questions."

There is no dearth of such questions. Why should the Post Office sell postage stamps? Lee asks. Millions of dollars could be saved each year if envelopes did not have to be placed just so for canceling. Why not contract with manufacturers to make envelopes with a special ink imprint that could be canceled photoelectrically, with the fee to the Post Office passed on to the envelope buyer? Why should post offices be built in the center of big cities? Perhaps the Post Office should switch to mail-processing factories close to airports. How much money can be saved by eliminating special-service windows in post offices?

The department also lacks vital information about itself. It has no well-defined standards of service, no continuing means of keeping track of how good a job it does, no real evidence that the present structure is the best for performing the tasks of the service. Lee is now talking with a management consultant about applying systems analysis to the department's over-all organization and may soon sign a contract for a study. Systems analysis already has been used to reorganize two of the department's six bureaus, and to examine transportation methods. Work is also under way on a "quality-service index," which would rate mail service between various cities on a regular monthly basis. The index may be in use within two years and eventually it may be used to establish standards for speed of service between most major cities.

The planning group has already had a substantial impact on the headquarters staff's previously sketchy forecasting procedures. It has introduced in the Post Office the planning-programming-budgeting system pioneered in the government by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. The focus is on the department's output, with activities divided into eight categories: direct service to mailers, processing, delivery, transportation, auxiliary services (such as money orders, the sale of migratory bird stamps, etc.), postal laws, research and development, and general support. Planning groups have been set up for each of these categories to forecast future demands and devise the means to meet them. One of Lee's specialists acts as coordinator for each category and the plans are all subject to his office's

criticism before they go to O'Brien for approval.

Initially, the program memoranda expected for each category must be based on a five-year projection. Actually, Lee points out, in some areas it is already possible to go well beyond that. Nothing really new is likely to be developed in modes of transportation, for example, in the next couple of decades: "it will still be air, rail, and highway. So we can plan out for perhaps twenty-five years." In mail processing, however, the surface has barely been scratched, and no one is now able to guess when the next breakthrough will come. "Here we need a shorter period to work in," Lee explains.

The planning director is careful to underplay the potential of his work. "I'd be an idiot to tell you that anything we have in mind will eliminate the deficit," he says. "What we will do is establish a standard of service and make the changes necessary to meet it." But Lee's analysts have begun to identify cost-reduction possibilities. Merely by reducing the time involved in transporting empty mailbags, Lee estimates, the Post Office can save \$9 million.

The real savings and improvements in efficiency, however, are expected from the efforts of the research and development team Packer is assembling. Because few men with the needed qualifications are available inside the organization, he is engaged in a vigorous talent search in industry and elsewhere in the government. It's not the easiest quest in the world; few research engineers normally think of a Post Office career. But Packer, a graduate of Harvard and Cornell who accepted the job because it offered "a virgin territory for achievement," is getting a good response from others to the same appeal. He has hired eighty new engineers, and is confident he will soon be able to fill half a dozen high-level executive posts.

SOME NEEDED CHANGES

The new research chief is outspokenly critical of the way his functions were carried out in the past. "The organization," he explains, "was fairly primitive compared to the needs. The accepted understanding of engineering—a service organization in a passive, defensive position answering the requirements of others, with no initiative or leadership—was totally unacceptable. The inventory of talents was too narrow for future needs. The breadth of attack was inadequate—essentially a fragmented approach to a huge problem crying for an integrated approach. And, in terms of modern engineering requirements, the caliber of people was too low." He quickly adds, however, that the flaws were not the fault of these running the program "it was just the system."

Packer is reorganizing the structure revising its priorities and reassigning its personnel. "We are shedding some blood," he says, "demoting some people and sidetracking others; a year from now fifteen of the top twenty people will have been brought in from the outside." He plans three major changes in the bureau's operations. It will initiate more projects rather than spend most of its time solving specific and frequently petty problems posed by other officials. It will play a larger role in the design and construction of the 800 to 900 new buildings the Post Office puts up each year now planned and executed mainly by regional officials. And it will "take into our own hands many of the things now done for us by private industry." In the past the department's research engineers spent practically all of their time supervising outside research contracts. Packer plans to build a laboratory in Washington, attached to a regular postal station, enabling his researchers to test ideas and systems on "live" mail.

He has no intention, however, of merely creating a larger, smarter, but equally in-

*Postal expenditures actually exceed current revenues of \$5 billion by more than \$1.2 billion. But Congress has ruled that certain expenses, such as losses incurred on delivery of mail sent by nonprofit organizations and on the operation of small rural post offices, are valuable public service costs that should be borne by all. That amount, therefore, is charged directly to the Treasury. Critics of the method for paying these public-service charges complain they have grown from a mere \$37 million in 1960 to an estimated \$567 million—and that the general public pays many costs that should be paid by mail users alone.

bred research organization. He hopes to use more outside expertise than ever before. As a start, twenty-eight technical experts and executives from private industry, government, and education have been recruited to form the Research and Engineering Advisory Council. Members come from construction, communication, information processing, electronics, automotive manufacturing, human engineering, and the aerospace industry. The council is expected to meet four times a year, with panels devoted to specific problem areas working almost on a continuing basis, and its recommendations will go directly to O'Brien. In addition, Packer plans a postal-technology symposium this year at which Post Office officials will outline for upwards of 100 research groups and technically oriented companies the technological needs of the department and the enormous dimensions of the market it offers industry.

Most of Packer's effort is directed at the long-term future. "We are applying ourselves to the problems ten years late," he says. "We are not doing things now that truly represent the state of the art. We must be looking forward to the possibilities in completely new fields of technology." But Packer is also very much involved in the current mechanization program, which is being accelerated at last after more than a decade of much talk but only cautious and half-hearted action.

THE LIMITS OF MECHANIZATION

Clearly there are limits to accomplishment in some phases of the postal process. Mechanization of collection and delivery, for example, does not look very promising. Mailmen will probably always be needed to pick up mail from hundreds of thousands of postboxes and to carry it to millions of front doors. But two-thirds of all postal workers are employed inside the nation's post offices, and even within the limitations of today's technology a great deal can be done to mechanize their jobs. O'Brien is determined to do it, and is spending four times as much on this task as the department did as recently as 1963.

The difference mechanization can make is dramatically evident in the five-year-old main station in Detroit—the department's operational proving ground for its most advanced devices. The building is located just off one of the city's many expressways. Broad driveways run into large truck maneuvering areas and 78,000 square feet of platform space. Two railroad tracks also serve the loading area, with space for fourteen cars.

As mail originating in Detroit is unloaded, the sacks are dumped into manhole-like drops onto conveyor systems that carry them to one of the building's four other floors. Letters are shaken out of the sacks onto another conveyor system that feeds them into a "culler"—a large spinning drum that permits only flat mail to pass. Hotel keys or rolls of photographic film, for example, are rejected for hand processing. The pieces pass on to an "edge-stacker," which flips the fast-moving letters into an upright position on their long sides. Square envelopes frequently tumble in the edger-stacker, and oversized envelopes won't fit—which is why the Post Office would like to get rid of both of them. A "facer-canceler" then locates the stamp, cancels it, postmarks the letter, and separates the mail automatically so that addresses are on the same side and can be processed by the sorting machine.

One of two new sorting devices in use in Detroit is worked by an operator who key-codes letters as they pass at the rate of sixty a minute. The keys set release mechanisms on moving metal slots into which the letters drop. When each slot reaches the proper sorting bin, the release mechanism is triggered and the letters fall into the bin. By this method operators process letters twice as fast as they can be sorted by hand. But an

equally important improvement is in the greater number of categories into which the operator divides the mail. A hand-sorting clerk can reach no more than eighty-four pigeonholes, and for this reason letters must be sorted and resorted until they are broken down into a carrier's load. The twenty-two machines in Detroit sort mail into 213 separate boxes, and can be programmed to make as many as 367 separations.

This device, however, is primitive compared with the zip-code reading machine now being tested in Detroit. Using two optical scanners, it can read printed or typed addresses and zip-code numbers on 36,000 letters an hour and divide them into as many categories as desired. The machine is not yet perfect. It rejects letters that carry any type other than the address or zip-code number in the last line on the envelope. Letters with the address askew or smudged are also rejected and the scanner does not read handwriting. But some 80 percent of all mail is business mail, almost all with typed or printed addresses. So the Post Office sees the scanner—with justification as a great hope for the future. Half a dozen are scheduled to go into post offices this year and O'Brien has said the system needs seventy of the \$260,000 machines. Once the mail has been sorted in Detroit, it goes into plastic trays on conveyers and is automatically directed to tying and sacking areas. Finally, again by conveyor, the sacks pass through a sorting machine similar to the keyboard letter sorter, then move on to the docks where they are loaded on rail cars or trucks for travel to the airport, to other cities, or to Detroit neighborhood stations for carrier delivery.

For the rest of the postal system, mechanization like Detroit's is far off. In the meantime, O'Brien is enlisting big mail users to help him prevent the service from suffering further deterioration. He is putting much of his hope for voluntary cooperation on 300 Mail Users Councils, organized in the past six years. Each council is made up of representatives of most of the large mail-generating firms in a given area, and they meet periodically with local postmasters and specialists in collection, processing, and transportation. In mid-January, for the first time, fifteen regional meetings of the councils were held to hear progress reports by postal officials, to discuss their own problems, and to explore new ideas for mailer cooperation, such as a proposed "early warning system" for alerting postal authorities in advance of heavy mailings.

THE BIGGEST FIGHTS LIE AHEAD

With the programs he has initiated or expanded over the past sixteen months, O'Brien has made an impressive start in his battle to improve the postal service. And he is not afraid to ask for money. His current budget request is for \$6.7 billion, a 6.7 percent increase. It includes a rise of 40.2 percent in spending for research and development, and of 45.9 percent in outlays for plant and equipment. But many of the most critical skirmishes lie ahead, and whether O'Brien, or anyone, can rescue the postal system is still very much in doubt.

UNNECESSARY INTEREST OF \$14½ BILLION A YEAR FOR 15 YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 6 and 7, I charged that the Federal Reserve System, and its present Chairman in particular, had ignored the public interest and had cost the American people more than \$211 billion in

excess interest charges over the past 15 years. Any public official who has cost the people \$14½ billion a year for 15 years in unnecessary interest burdens is a luxury we cannot longer afford.

As I noted in these two speeches, President Johnson has a great opportunity to start correcting this situation by refusing to reappoint William McChesney Martin as Chairman on March 31, and by allowing Federal Reserve Governor Charles N. Shepardson to retire on April 30.

These are actions which the President can take in the next few weeks. But they are limited actions and they will not solve the entire problem. The President's action will not absolve the Congress of its responsibility to set our monetary policies straight.

Under the so-called seized independence of the Federal Reserve, the hands of the President of the United States are virtually handcuffed in dealing effectively with monetary policy. This results directly from the Congress' failure to do its duty over the years. Congress has abdicated its constitutional role in this area and has allowed the Federal Reserve to move and more move out from under the control of the people and their elected representatives.

Of course, we have President Eisenhower to blame for most of this situation. It was the last Republican President who so willingly gave in to William McChesney Martin and allowed the Federal Reserve to seize its independence. President Eisenhower, apparently, was sadly mistaken about the statutes and thought that the Federal Reserve was some sort of second government in Washington. President Eisenhower's mistake has cost the country billions and billions of dollars and is responsible for the highest interest rate in 40 years which now plague the Nation.

To correct these Republican errors, and to bring a semblance of sanity to our monetary affairs, I have introduced H.R. 11. Basically, this bill is designed to return the control of monetary policy to the people and their elected representatives, including the President and the U.S. Congress. This bill is not revolutionary in any sense. All it does is put the Federal Reserve Board on essentially the same footing as any other Federal agency.

In short, the Federal Reserve would have to play the game by the rules. Under H.R. 11, the Federal Reserve would no longer receive favored treatment and its bureaucrats would have to abide by the same regulations and laws as do all other Federal employees.

Is it revolutionary to expect the Federal Reserve to abide by the Constitution and the laws of the land? I certainly hope not.

My bill would make the term of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board coterminous with the President's tenure and would reduce the members of the Federal Reserve Board from 7 to 5, and their terms from 14 years to 5 years. Under this bill, the President would be able to choose a Board that would work in harmony with the economic policies and programs of the administration.

As things stand now, the terms of the members of the Board are staggered in such a manner as to prevent a President from ever gaining effective control. He cannot appoint a majority of the Board until his last year in office—and this is dependent upon a President being elected to two full terms. By the time he appoints a majority, he is almost out of office and is in a "lameduck" status.

This means that he never does have a real chance to direct monetary policy.

It is perfectly absurd that the President and the Congress can determine whether this country is at war or peace, when and where young men shall be compelled to serve in combat, whether nuclear bombs are to be dropped or not, how many billions should be assessed in taxation, and how much money should be spent for all facets of American life, and yet have absolutely no control over the money supply and the credit of the most influential and economically powerful nation on earth.

H.R. 11 would coordinate the Nation's money policy with the general economic goals of the administration by requiring the Federal Reserve to report regularly to Congress on its activities to implement the President's economic programs.

The bill would also abolish the Open Market Committee which determines the extent of the money supply through its bond purchases and sales, and vest this power in the Federal Reserve Board directly. In this way, the Board would be directly responsible for its actions to the President and the Congress in this most vital area of monetary policy.

The bill would call for repayment in full of the nonproprietary Federal Reserve stock now in the hands of the private banks. This would put to rest for all time the spurious allegations that have been pushed off on the American people—that the private commercial banks own the system. The retirement of the Federal Reserve stock would prevent the myth of bank ownership from being perpetuated.

The bill further provides for an annual audit of the Federal Reserve System by the General Accounting Office. It is ridiculous that no independent or governmental audit has ever been made of America's Federal Reserve banking system since its inception five decades ago. The bankers opposed to improving the Federal Reserve System do not favor such an audit, yet bankers are the first to require a satisfactory audit of those who seek to borrow money from the banks.

H.R. 11 would also require the Federal Reserve to turn all of its revenue over to the Treasury and annually receive its needed funds for operations via the traditional congressional authorization and appropriation route. Then if monetary policy is not operated properly the people will have a chance to punish their elected representatives who are responsible.

The appropriations process is, of course, a traditional means for the Congress to find out what is happening inside the various Federal agencies. It provides a check on the activities of the agencies as well as a control over the use of public money. This is an important

step in our democratic processes and it is certainly one which should be followed fully in the vital area of monetary policy. There is no logical reason why the Federal Reserve should escape the scrutiny of the Appropriations Committee each year. Unelected officials cannot be held accountable even though they ruin the country but elected officials like the President and Members of Congress can be held accountable by the voters. Elected officials should not be allowed to abdicate their sworn duties.

If it is logical, and in the public interest, for the Federal Reserve to escape this scrutiny, then it would follow that the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Commerce, and all agencies of the executive branch, likewise, be accorded this treatment. Of course, this would, in effect, destroy the role of the Congress and would effectively eliminate the checks and balances set up in our Constitution.

I hope that the members of the Appropriations Committees, who rightfully guard their prerogatives in checking and controlling the expenditures of the executive branch, will join me in the demand that the Federal Reserve be brought under this process.

In addition to providing an annual check on the activities of the Federal Reserve, the appropriations route would also eliminate the need for the Federal Reserve to hold onto \$45 billion worth of Government bonds. The Federal Reserve now holds these bonds in the New York Federal Reserve Bank and demands an annual interest payment of between \$1.7 billion and \$1.8 billion on this holding. Now these are bonds which have already been paid for once by the American taxpayers; yet, the Federal Reserve continues to demand and receive \$1.8 billion payment on them annually.

The Federal Reserve finances its far-flung operations out of this huge slush fund which is unaudited, unchecked, and unaccounted for. No one really knows just where all this money goes. We have discovered the ultimate recipients of some of this huge fund. At least \$90,000 goes as dues to various banking associations, including the American Bankers Association—the lobbying organization for the Nation's commercial banks.

I do not believe that the Appropriations Committees of either House would allow such a misuse of public funds if the Federal Reserve was required to come before them for appropriations. No other Federal agency, to my knowledge, pays dues to a lobbying organization—only the Federal Reserve.

H.R. 11 would put an end to such funny money tactics at the Federal Reserve. I have confidence that the Appropriations Committees would see to that.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that H.R. 11 will not destroy the Federal Reserve System. It will not wreck our monetary system. It will strengthen the confidence of the American people in our monetary system by giving them a voice in the determination of its policies. It will make a group of bureaucrats responsive to the will of the people and their elected representatives. That is

the essence of democracy and I cannot see how anyone who believes in democratic principles could oppose the idea.

H.R. 11 will return to Congress to its traditional, constitutional role in determining monetary policy. It will remove the policymaking decisions from the hands of the special interests and return them to the people where they belong in a democratic society.

LAND ACQUISITION BILL AND RELATED LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a tripartite package of bills designed to revise and reform the Federal land acquisition policy. The first bill, and the primary part of this three-part proposed legislation, is drafted so as to eliminate the present archaic, unrealistic, and unfair system that affects thousands of persons whose property is taken annually under the power of eminent domain.

This particular bill, which would be known as the Fair Compensation Act of 1967, is based on the recommendations of a task force of the House Public Works Committee which made an intensive review of Federal land acquisition policies in the 88th Congress. It has since gathered dust and has been ignored in Great Society circles.

The unfairness of the present policy has been made abundantly clear by the hundreds of requests for help I have received from residents in the Stockton and Kaysinger Reservoir areas, and others, who simply cannot replace their farms and other property with the dollars they are offered by the Corps of Engineers. Federal programs involved would be those that include reservoir acquisition, urban renewal, missile sites, and others involving Federal funds.

The more I have studied the problem the more I have been convinced that the major problem is not so much with the interpretation of the law, as it is the basic law itself. People whose land is under the threat of condemnation expect to receive fair market value for their property, but the term "fair market value" presumes a willing seller and a willing buyer; and, indeed, existing legislation prescribes it. It also presumes a willing buyer. What about the times when the owner of property is not a willing seller, as has occurred in countless circumstances at these Federal projects? I have example after example in my files of cases. They have all been referred to the Corps of Engineers, and indeed that Corps has been most cooperative, including the Under Secretaries of the Army, in going to the area and holding hearings. But I have files of cases where a farmer, who accepted a so-called fair market value offer for his property, could not begin to replace his farm with what the Government paid him. There are some who have been on these farms for generations, and are now physically disabled. He has to sell on terms the Government prescribes, and

he has to buy on terms the free market prescribes, often on terms boosted up by land speculators. The average person in a Federal acquisition project is a man caught in the middle. He stands alone against the entire colossus of big government, and his bargaining position is pitifully weak considering the vast machinery of Government manpower and money that sits on the other side of the bargaining table. He may have opposed or not been consulted about the project in the beginning.

Oftentimes the speculators and the downtown builders come to Washington and sell a project, whereas the landowner stays at home and tends to his crops. His disadvantage is further compounded by the fact that, in contrast to the vast amount of displacement and disruption in present-day programs, the market value standard, limiting compensation to the value of the property taken, was adopted by the courts in a comparatively uncomplicated time in our Nation's history, when land was plentiful, and Government acquisitions skirted cities and bypassed homes and businesses, causing few displacement and relatively little damage.

In fact, it was less than 100 years ago, Mr. Speaker, that this very Congress devised techniques, the homestead law and others, not only to get land out of the Federal domain into the hands of private individuals but, strange as it would seem today, they devised the same technique to get moneys from the Federal Treasury into the hands of the people. Needless to say, at that time we had a considerable surplus.

Nevertheless, the Federal courts have made it plain that they are bound by the established precedents, and that it is the responsibility of the Congress to determine whether other losses suffered by property owners—or by tenants—should be absorbed by the public. The amount of disruption caused by Federal and federally assisted programs is astoundingly large. The accelerated pace of government activity, supported by broadened concepts of public use, make any lessening of current activity in the foreseeable future highly unlikely.

As I pointed out when I introduced similar legislation in the 89th Congress, in each of the next 7 years, Federal and federally assisted programs are expected to require the acquisition of real property from 183,000 separate ownerships, and the displacement of approximately 111,000 households, 17,860 businesses, 2,310 farm operations, and some disruption of an additional 1,350 farms. This situation has not changed.

The market value standard of just compensation under the fifth amendment requires payment for the property taken, but does not provide for other losses or expenses, however severe, that may be incurred by property owners or tenants because of the taking of property.

Typical losses of this kind are:

First. Cost of moving personal property and the disconnecting, dismantling, reassembling, and reinstalling of structures, machinery, and equipment;

Second. Transportation and other ex-

penses to move a displaced family to replacement housing;

Third. Transportation and other expenses in search of a replacement farm or other property;

Fourth. Expenses in obtaining substitute real property, such as costs of appraisal, survey, financing, title examination, and closing costs;

Fifth. Expenses incident to the transfer of title to real property required for public use, such as recording fees, transfer taxes and clerk fees; and

Sixth. Loss of crop income due to unreasonable closing dates.

Furthermore, most displacements affect low or moderate income families or individuals for whom a force move generally is a very difficult financial experience. The problem is aggravated for the elderly, the large family, and it becomes more so depending on the distance they must move to relocate.

Here is a battlefield in the poverty problem that has been completely ignored by the poverty warriors in the executive branch.

It is time that concern for the effects of displacement by Government action is consistent with the policy of the Nation to assure economic and social opportunity for every citizen. A greater share of the economic costs of displacement should be borne by the public on a uniform basis, since it is the public interest which benefits from the use of the right of eminent domain in the first place. This is by definition.

This bill includes the following changes in Government policy:

First. Congress would declare that owners and tenants of property acquired for public programs, either Federal or federally assisted, shall be afforded fair and equitable treatment on a basis as nearly uniform as practicable; that owners and tenants shall be fairly compensated for their property and for other losses and necessary expenses incurred because of such programs; and that every reasonable effort shall be made to prevent hardships to persons caused to move from their homes, farms, or places of business, or to lose their employment, or to suffer other economic injury as a direct result of such programs, including planned retirement.

Second. That Congress establish a uniform policy to guide the land acquisition practices of all Federal agencies in order to assure consistent and equitable treatment. These new practices would include:

Every reasonable effort to acquire real property by kindly and friendly negotiated purchase. Instead of threats and harassment, which occur all too often under present law, we will insure bargain and barter.

Real property should be appraised before the initiation of negotiations, and the owner should be given an opportunity to accompany the appraiser during his inspection of the property.

Before the initiation of negotiations for property, the head of the Federal agency concerned should establish a price which he believes to be fair and reasonable consideration therefor, and should make a prompt offer to acquire

the property for the full amount so established. The initial offer should not be less than the appraised fair value of the property as approved by the agency head.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this procedure would eliminate some haggling and horse trading, and, also, it would eliminate the parties being hauled into Federal court, because, perhaps, for generations these people have been proud of the fact that they have not been in a similar position, but appreciate the particular value of the property.

Congress provides a definition of "market value standard" which assures that the compensation required for property shall be the highest price which the property could reasonably be expected to bring if exposed for sale in the open market for a reasonable time, unaffected by the project. Now, this implies no leapfrogging or boxing in and it certainly implies that all properties are assayed at the same price and that the individual will be reimbursed for expenses incidental to transfer of the title to the United States.

Relocation payments be provided for all displaced persons on a uniform basis in all programs conducted by the Federal Government, or with the assistance of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, my second bill or leg of this legislative triangle, seeks to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for more equitable treatment of persons affected by capital gains caused by involuntary sales of real property through eminent domain to the Federal Government or through federally assisted programs.

Congress would provide that an owner of property taken for public use may defer any recognition of the gain on the transfer, if he reinvests the compensation received for the property in first, any real property; second, any property used in trade or business; and third, any property to be held by the taxpayer for investment.

It is this latter investment outlet that has been so objectionable to our friends in the Treasury Department and more particularly to our friends in the Internal Revenue Service. What our fiscal friends and foes alike do not understand, is that a majority of the farms taken by Federal acquisition programs are owned and operated by people in their middle or later years. These people have little if no desire to reinvest in a new farm and try to rebuild a farming operation that took 25 or more years to build in the first place. This is augmented by the additional problem that a majority of these farms fall within the marginal operation category. So this amendment to the Internal Revenue Code will give persons displaced by eminent domain a more just and equitable treatment in regards to capital gains so as to make them financially self-sufficient all to the end of furthering our agricultural policy and reducing the number of marginal producers.

It is paradoxical, Mr. Speaker, that usually these improvements in particular occur in areas of high, rugged terrain

with a minimum of alluvial land that is tillable in the valleys.

The third final bill or element, Mr. Speaker, of this interrelated legislative unit is an amendment to the Small Business Act to provide assistance for owners and employees of small business concerns displaced or injured by Federal or federally assisted programs. This assistance would take the form of loans, information, and other assistance.

Perhaps, at least, it is the time that we should not exercise the right of eminent domain to condemn private lands so that our interconnections and our high voltage lines for the Federal grid system would not go through already held Federal property, or even the forests, but would condemn additional private land.

But in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, it will also have the effect of placing more pressure on the Director of the Budget to establish more selective priorities on what we need, and to make doubly certain that the public interests justify the initiation of new programs and of course continue to protect the taxpayers' moneys.

This would be a healthy development at a time when the deficit of our Federal budget is soaring, and at a time when there is an acceleration of Federal land acquisition programs at the expense of private land ownership.

A recent article of farmland entitled "Happy Motoring—No Matter the Farmer," also calls attention to our outdated Federal land acquisition policies. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, request unanimous consent to insert this article in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BINGHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

HAPPY MOTORING—NO MATTER THE FARMER
(By Jay Richter and Eileen Quigley)

When a problem affects a large number of people all over the nation and begins to spread and grow, it's natural for the citizens involved to look to Washington for a solution.

The problem affecting farmers and other landowners who don't want to give their land up for road-building or other government projects has been around for some time.

But public-use projects are ramifying at such a rate that farmers are beginning to feel as if they are being "plowed under" along with the vast areas of farmland now disappearing under concrete.

And naturally they want to know what can be done about it in Washington.

Since farmland is one of our greatest national assets, it seems as if there ought to be an agency or department of government for preserving agricultural land just as there is an agency dedicated to the conserving of our soil.

In fact, the agricultural land that provides food not only for our citizens but for millions of hungry people all over the world ought to be declared a National Treasure and guarded against depredations of all kinds—even those made by our own conflicting national needs.

But since there is no such agency, it will probably be up to those on the land to help themselves as it has long been their tradition to do. Farmers are going to have to

make enough noise about their rights and needs in cases of land acquisitions to be heard in Congress, and if they want something done about their problem, they are going to have to put their weight where it will be felt and give the needed leverage.

The, will have to keep in mind the proverb, "It's the squeaking wheel that gets the grease."

The plight of farmers and other property owners caught in a widening vortex of government land-taking is typified by farmers in Iowa who are fighting construction of a section of I-35, an interstate highway that will cut diagonally through their farms, leaving odd-shaped pieces of land difficult, dangerous or impossible to farm.

This proposed highway will slash through some of the richest agricultural land in the U.S., and will hamper farming in that area at a time when hunger is increasing in the world and the President has called on farmers for increased production.

Farmers are angry about the diagonal partly because Iowa roads have generally followed section or sub-section lines (thus doing less damage to farmland) and partly because there was general expectation that the highway would follow a straight-line route that had been studied previously.

And they are upset because they believe the diagonal routing was imposed on them by forces outside Iowa—namely, by authorities in Washington, at the behest of urban interests in Mason City that lobbied for the diagonal that would bring the highway closer to Mason City.

The feel unrepresented in the case, and they are concerned, not only over the unnecessary loss of productive farmland, but because they are certain the diagonal will open the door to the building of more diagonals in Iowa.

Various elements in the state have named the Bureau of Public Roads in Washington as the "villain of the piece," and blame it for forcing on the state the diagonal plan which no one in rural Iowa seems to have wanted.

So what does the Bureau of Public Roads have to say for itself on the matter? It says it recognizes the plight of the property owner and sympathizes, but it must weigh all the factors involved and make the best practical decision.

(Since sympathy can never compete with such factors as economy in these cases, it is clear that farmers will not get far by looking to the roadbuilding authorities for support in trying to hold onto their land.)

An official of the Bureau, asked about the decision on the diagonal, was quick to hand the problem back to Iowa.

"The first thing to remember," he said, "is that this is not a matter of farmers versus the Bureau of Public Roads. It's a group of individual farmers versus the Iowa Highway Commission. The Bureau doesn't decide on a route.

"We review proposals on the basis of legislation prescribing general standards, and either approve or disapprove the proposal. We did not decide the route for I-35—we merely approved the route proposed by the Iowa Highway Commission."

In reviewing the case, he said a study made by Iowa highway men of the original straight-line road proposal was found by the Bureau to have insufficient justification, since it paralleled Highway 69, which already served the cities on its route.

One of the main objectives of a new road, as the Bureau saw it, "was to serve Mason City—a major community and financial, marketing and agricultural center in that part of the state."

"In considering a route for a new highway," the official continued, "there are many complicated factors to be weighed against each other to find the best practical route.

"A plan for a road must take into con-

sideration through traffic, local traffic, side traffic, and how all these would be better served. Among the considerations to be weighed are the local benefits, the travel surfaces, the economic and social impact of the location of the road, the economic costs (both of building the highway and for users of it) and so on. And then we have to balance them all.

"In any routing, we know that uprooting of people from the land will occur. We didn't write this off—we have it in mind when locating a route. We have the impact on people, the displacing of people, in mind, and know it will be present wherever a road is located. But we have to find the optimal solution.

"The optimal solution is based on the law which established the interstate highway system. This is the Federal Aid to Highways Act, which says the system shall be designated by 'routes as practical' to serve principal cities, industrial cities, military establishments, and so on, and says that, in determining the route, local needs, 'to the extent practicable, suitable and feasible,' shall be given equal consideration to the needs of interstate commerce."

That, he explained, was where Mason City comes in. A motorist driving from the south to the north and passing through Iowa doesn't care about going to Mason City; he represents interstate commerce.

But other motorists, local and non-local, want to go to Mason City; and the law says serve the local needs also. Hence the need for a highway going nearer to Mason City.

So the Bureau directed the Iowa Highway Commission to make a restudy of the routing. After hearings and discussions of four basic alternatives in the state, the Commission submitted the diagonal routing and the Bureau approved it. The diagonal routing, the Bureau man emphasized, was the only actual proposed route ever formally presented to the Bureau.

The inescapable conclusion here is that even if the Bureau only approves or disproves of proposals made by the state highway people, the power of disapproval is a formidable lever in bringing the state around to a position the Bureau favors.

Another Bureau spokesman told us that studies showed more economy in the diagonal routing, for building the highway and for users, too. The right of way acquisition and construction would be somewhat more expensive per mile on the diagonal, he pointed out, but there was a saving in miles, and he said the Bureau was certain this represented the best decision from the overall economic standpoint.

This official also said that where a road leaves odd-shaped pieces of land, these can sometimes be put to other uses, such as roadside parks and game sanctuaries.

Where such pieces of land are used for borrow pits from which dirt is taken for highway grading, he suggested the state highway department, along with conservation people, might look into the possibility of creating roadside lakes, as has been done on Interstate 80 in Nebraska.

In places on I-80 where it was necessary to dig for grading, lakes and ponds were made, and these have proved popular, especially with people from Omaha and Lincoln who like to go fishing there.

All this gives us the Bureau's view, while falling to grapple with the question of pre-emption of highly productive farmland for other uses. It also leaves us with the certainty that roadmakers will continue to make roads while leaving to others such problems as preserving rich farmland.

And further, they will continue to make roads on the basis of the legislation that empowers them to make roads—and if that legislation does not contain provisions for avoiding the condemnation of productive agricultural land where possible, then there

will be nothing to stop that land from going under concrete when roads and other public works require it.

Or, in a case like that of I-35 in Iowa, unless laws are passed that forbid the cutting of roads diagonally through farmland, farmers can expect to see more diagonals of that kind when new roads are made.

Obviously, what is needed is for the farmer to have a voice in the making of the laws on which the road system and other public works are built. More attention to the rights of property owners, and provisions for fairer compensation for those whose lands are taken should be worked into the legal basis on which land is acquired.

A movement in this direction is already under way.

The crisis in Iowa led to the adoption by the Iowa Farm Bureau of a resolution against diagonal road construction in the state unless absolutely necessary, and the proposal that state and federal highways should be built, not only by estimating convenience and cost to the traveling public, as now, but tempered by an estimate of inconvenience and loss caused to the property owners.

This was followed in December by a resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its national convention to the effect that highway routes should be chosen to avoid diagonal highways and the use of productive agricultural lands where feasible. This resolution will be part of the national policy of county and state Farm Bureaus and the national Farm Bureau.

So already a powerful voice in farm circles is being raised in favor of the farmer and his land in this matter.

But there is a gap between favoring something and getting a law on the books to make it a reality.

Legislative help may be on the way.

A bill to see that farmers and others get fair compensation for their land when they sell to the government, and fair treatment when the land is acquired, was introduced into Congress last March by Rep. Durward Hall of Missouri. It will probably be reintroduced in the coming session of Congress.

Congressman Hall, a surgeon with a distinguished record of public medical service who is now representing the Seventh District of Missouri, was made aware of the problem of private property owners by requests for help from farmers and others in his district who could not replace their farms and other property with the compensation offered by the government.

His bill, which would be known as the Fair Compensation Act, deals with lands taken for roads, conservation, flood control, missile sites, and such, under Federal or federally assisted program. Besides aiming for fairer treatment for property owners, it would set up a uniform policy on the land acquisitions practices of all Federal Agencies.

In introducing his bill, Dr. Hall said of the current land acquisition policy, "The present system is archaic, unrealistic, and unfair to thousands of persons whose property is taken each year under the power of eminent domain."

Each year for the next seven years, Dr. Hall told Congress, Federal and federally assisted programs will require the displacement of about 2,310 farm operations and some disruption of an additional 1,350 farms.

Multiply those figures by seven and you have an alarming total of farm displacement.

Among the new practices the bill would put into effect would be "every reasonable effort to acquire real property by kindly and friendly negotiated purchase. Instead of threats and harassment, which occur all too often under present law, we will insure bargain and barter."

Another innovation would be the provision that real property should be appraised before the initiation of negotiations and the owner given an opportunity to accompany the appraiser during his inspection of the property.

Before negotiations begin, the agency should establish a fair price, Dr. Hall believes, and should make a prompt offer to acquire the property for the full amount, and the initial offer should not be less than the appraised fair value as approved by the agency head.

Dr. Hall wants the agency buying the land to provide the property owner with reasonable information concerning its opinion of the value of the property. And, he believes that where partial taking would leave an uneconomic remnant, the agency should take the entire property.

Another provision is for Congress to provide a definition of "market value standard" which would assure that the compensation required for property "shall be the highest price which the property could reasonably be expected to bring if exposed for sale for a reasonable time, unaffected by the project."

Reimbursement for expenses of transferring title, and expenses incident to relocation, are also provided for in the bill.

"People whose land is under threat of condemnation," Dr. Hall told Congress, "expect to receive fair market value for their property, but the term 'fair market value' presumes a willing seller and a willing buyer."

"What about the times when the owner of property is not a willing seller, as has occurred in countless circumstances at Federal projects?"

"I have example after example in my files of cases where a farmer who accepted a so-called fair market value offer for his property could not begin to replace his farm with what the Government paid him. He has to sell on terms the Government prescribes, and he has to buy on terms the free market prescribes, often on terms boosted up by land speculators."

Dr. Hall went on to say, "The average person in a Federal acquisition project is a man caught in the middle. He stands alone against the entire colossus of big government, and his bargaining position is pitifully weak considering the vast machinery of Government manpower and money that sits on the other side of the bargaining table."

The market value standard of compensation, he said, limiting payment to the value of the property taken, was adopted by the courts at a time in our history when land was plentiful and government acquisitions caused much less disruption than they do now.

But the Federal courts are bound by precedent, and therefore it is Congress that must take the responsibility of determining whether other losses suffered by property owners should be absorbed by the public.

"A greater share of the economic costs of displacement," Dr. Hall stated, "should be borne by the public on a uniform basis, since it is the public interest which benefits from the use of the right of eminent domain in the first place."

"It is time," he said, "that concern for the effects of displacement by Government action is consistent with the policy of the Nation to assure economic and social opportunity for every citizen."

Farmers will say amen to that. But they will have to act, too.

Getting action on legislation means putting a lot of shoulders to a lot of wheels, and seeing that they squeak, loud.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I call upon the gentleman to whom this bipartisan package may be referred, the chairmen of the respective committees, and the distinguished gentlemen of those committees, to call for departmental representation.

I would also like to say, in closing, that this action received, with some suggestions for amendment in the 88th Congress, favorable departmental representation,

including the Corps of Engineers. I hope it can be called up and hearings held, and that it can be considered by this body at the earliest practicable date.

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

WHO IS THE BIG 10 KIDDING?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAILSBACK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, supporters of collegiate athletics in the State of Illinois have been shocked and disturbed by the penalties recently handed down to the University of Illinois, three of its coaches, and several players on teams of the university. The discipline handed out by the athletic directors and faculty representatives of the other schools participating in the Big 10 Conference stems from the existence of a fund maintained by friends of the university for the athletes.

University officials themselves revealed the existence of this fund when it was brought to their attention by a staff member, and themselves instituted discipline of those who were aware of its operation. They have not tried to hide the fact that the fund violates Big 10 rules.

But then comes the Big 10 recommendation that the coaches aware of the fund must be fired or the school forced out of the conference and that the players who received aid be given permanent or long suspensions from athletic participation in the Big 10. This action has been roundly decried as unnecessarily harsh by many observers of the situation.

For the boys' part, they received aid in the form of extra spending money which amounted to approximately \$1 per day. One boy, Steve Kuberski, of Moline, Ill., was told that he would have to work for his money by working for local firms in his hometown during vacations and semester breaks and would not receive compensation for such work. All of them were told by their advisers that this was completely all right and not in violation of any rules. Were the boys naive? Perhaps so, but their advice came from men they respected and trusted most.

But what of the men who gave that advice, representatives of the school, the coaches? A case for innocence cannot be built for them in that, unlike the boys, they knew of the existence of the special fund for athletes. They hardly could have helped but know that this violated the rules of the Big 10.

But should they and their school alone be penalized for this? Should their lives be ruined, perhaps their careers ended. Men of the sports world know there are no finer men in the coaching profession than Pete Elliot, Harry Combes, and Howard Braun. But they, like others, are caught in a system. Who is Commissioner Reed of the Big 10 kidding? Is Illinois alone guilty of "special arrangements" to get around recruiting rules in big-times athletics? The persistent rumors we hear and the periodic "scandals" suggest not.

Athletics should be a system with the interests of the participating boys paramount, never a means of corrupting and defaming them by schemes beyond their awareness or understanding.

Too long have we allowed "show business" aspects of intercollegiate athletics to overshadow the educational values of the student athlete and the school. The "system" sees one school vying against another for high school stars. The boys are told that this is the way its done—that its all legal.

If these athletics need money to continue their education and are prevented from working as some students are by their participation in athletics, then let their aid be increased to cover their needs, but let it be from legitimate school funds, as for other students.

What seems to be needed is a thorough investigation by the Big 10 and other athletic organizations of the entire system. Let not Illinois, its coaches and players alone shoulder the blame for an unhealthy situation. Let it all be brought out in the open—at Illinois and at every school. Let the problems be aired. Let honest solutions be formed. And let intercollegiate athletic competition return to the honored place in American life it deserves.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my distinguished colleague from Illinois, TOM RAILSBACK, for taking the initiative in bringing to the attention of the Members of Congress the serious problem which confronts the universities participating in the Big 10 Conference.

Payments made from a special fund to University of Illinois athletes has resulted in the Big 10 recommendation for severe penalties. While the present controversy involves the State of Illinois, actually the matter has much wider significance. The time has come for the problem to be aired by all our colleges and universities throughout the Nation.

I associate myself with Congressman RAILSBACK's remarks and call upon those who are in charge of the system to bring into the open the relationship between athletes and schools with reference to special payments to athletes to help them continue their education.

The matter must be resolved so that athletes can have access to legitimate financial assistance if they need it to complete their college education.

Again, I commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAILSBACK] for his understanding of this problem and his forthright efforts in seeking to effect an equitable solution.

POLICY IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BINGHAM). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the last

few days have seen renewed controversy surrounding our country's policy in Vietnam. Once again the focus of this controversy is this Nation's efforts to begin negotiations to end the war. Once again the critics demand that the United States again take the first magnanimous step—expecting nothing in return. Once again it is demanded that we do almost anything, regardless of dangerous consequences, to convince proven aggressors of our peaceful intentions.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the time has come when we can and should expect the North Vietnamese, for just one time, to clearly show their own willingness to negotiate.

On five separate occasions the United States has suspended bombing of North Vietnam. In the last 2½ months alone we have ceased the bombing of North Vietnam on three separate occasions, the last time from February 8 through February 18. This last halt was extended for more than 36 hours beyond the original deadline of 7 a.m. February 12 in order to give Hanoi additional time to show some willingness to come to the truce table. Not one of these bombing suspensions has provoked any sign of response from North Vietnam. The North Vietnamese have neither taken reciprocal action, cutting down on their military activity, or initiated any diplomatic maneuver. The sad lesson has been that each time we have stopped bombing the north, North Vietnam has stepped up its military activity.

Only last week the hopes of the world again rose when a North Vietnamese delegation visited Burma and met with U.N. Secretary-General U Thant. Once again, nothing happened. The North Vietnamese could have used that visit or many other chances to state publicly or privately that they are either immediately or at some future date ready to begin peace talks.

It should be noted by those who claim that we are taking a hard line position on peace negotiations that we have never asked for a North Vietnamese surrender or complete withdrawal of enemy troops as North Vietnam demands of us.

Recently one outspoken critic of the administration charged that President Johnson is unwilling to negotiate and that, in fact, the administration has hardened its position toward negotiations. Mr. Speaker, this accusation is without foundation.

From the very beginning this administration has sought only one objective in Vietnam—an end to Communist aggression against South Vietnam. We have sought this objective by military action in defense of South Vietnam while at the same time pursuing every possible approach toward beginning negotiations aimed at a peaceful end to the fighting.

Mr. Speaker, charges that the administration has hardened its terms for negotiations by demanding from Hanoi the prior assurance of some reciprocal act as a condition to our ending the bombing of North Vietnam are filled with inconsistencies. The President has repeated time and time again that the United States is willing to negotiate unconditionally, any time and any place, in public or in pri-

vate, with North Vietnam. Indeed our policy shows that we definitely do not require a prior act as a condition to our suspending bombing of North Vietnam. We have, to repeat myself, already halted the bombing unilaterally several times without any reply before or after suspension.

Whether critics of the administration realize it or not, willingness to negotiate requires will and initiative on both sides of a dispute. The United States has repeatedly shown its willingness. North Vietnam has not.

The responsibility of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces requires that he increase the risk to our soldiers by ceasing the bombing of the north only under the most promising of circumstances. The President, has seen fit to take that step for five separate periods since 1965, but he has received no response from North Vietnam.

I and millions of other Americans find it increasingly difficult to believe that American and allied soldiers alone must suffer in an attempt to get a determined enemy to simply start talking about ending a war. The negotiations we are talking about may well go on while the war goes on, and unless there is a cease-fire, the United States should continue to press to the utmost.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with those who claim the United States has changed its standards against Vietnamese negotiations. It is however high time for North Vietnam to take the first step toward peace. Their total failure to respond to our continued peace offensive cannot be of a lack of their belief in our sincerity. It can only be because they do not wish to negotiate.

President Johnson is to be commended for his decision last month to resume the bombing of North Vietnam. The continuance of this air assault is vital to our war effort. With the Communist's demonstrated refusal to negotiate, continued bombing is one of our most useful tools in eventually bringing about the negotiations we so ardently seek. I fervently hope and trust that the President will continue his skillful and carefully controlled use of America's vast resources in response to Hanoi's steadily increased aggression against South Vietnam.

SELF-HELP IN SOUTH AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, community action is rarely used as an underpinning of Alliance for Progress programs. This omission is generally attributed to Iberian traditions which supposedly discourage self-help organization among the people. A Peace Corps report, which has come to my attention, directly contradicts this assumption. Tracing the positive response of the people to a Colombian Government program, the Peace Corps states:

The philosophy of Acción Comunal in Colombia originates from the historical tradition of Colombians in uniting together

in social and religious activities as well as family projects. This tradition applies to both rural and urban communities.

In recognition of the tremendous potential of individual initiative and energy the Government created Public Law 19 in 1958, which sought to accelerate the process of economic and social development of the Nation by giving the concept of Acción Comunal official blessing. The División de Acción Comunal was created by a Decree passed in 1959. The División functioned for several months under the Ministry of Education but was later placed under the Ministry of Government by a new Decree passed in 1960.

From the beginning the División sought ways to meet the needs of the numerous Juntas de Acción Comunal that were already formed unofficially and to respond to the growing interest of people that were anxious to utilize their aptitudes and latent energies for the good of the community.

While it is agreed upon that a true Community Development program demands the participation of the people and the effective utilization of its resources, it must be borne in mind that within the educational process of Community Development certain stimulus is required in the form of technical assistance and/or materials that generally are not found within the community. The neglect of these felt needs could create situations of frustration and dissatisfaction in the communities.

To fulfill this function, to meet the growing demands of the Colombian people, and to better effect the coordination of the various government and private organizations who can lend material and technical assistance to community projects it is urgently necessary to expand the División de Acción Comunal.

Unfortunately, little information is available through official Washington channels. Other sources have supplied fragmentary facts. In more than 9,000 rural communities throughout Colombia, local community action councils—juntas—have been organized. In 1964, the program was allocated more than 1.5 percent of the national budget—over \$6 million. According to Director Vicente Pizano Restrepo, 11 percent of the school construction funds of the Ministry of Education is earmarked for use by Acción Comunal each year. The program operates an 8-month training course which has graduated more than 200 local community action workers.

Today, 230 Peace Corps volunteers assigned to rural development are working with Acción Comunal personnel as counterparts. The Peace Corps report, written early in 1965, describes the functions and activities of the program, as follows:

II. FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF ACCION COMUNAL

It is the legal function of the División de Acción Comunal to direct all Community Development activities in Colombia. Within this framework its responsibilities are:

- A) Coordination
 - B) Promotion
 - C) Training and Technical Development
 - D) General Evaluation of the Programs
- which are explained as follows:

Coordination

Coordination of Community Development is carried out at different levels. At the National level Acción Comunal first and foremost coordinates its activities with the Administrative Department of Planning and Technical Services so that it can become a part of the total development of the Country. It also coordinates programs and projects

with the Ministries of War, Education, Agriculture and Health. It has programs with National Institutions such as INA (Instituto Nacional de Alimentación), PINA (Programa Integrado para Nutrición Aplicada), and Caminos Vecinales which has been the principal collaborator in the development of Juntas by designating funds for community projects.

At the Departmental level the División has agreements with all Departments to assist in the development of Departmental offices of Acción Comunal.

Furthermore, coordination is carried out with private organizations such as FEPRANAL (Federación de Sector Privado para Acción Comunal) and with Shell Oil Company. At the International level, the División coordinates its activities with U.S. Peace Corps and the Netherlands Peace Corps (the latter working in Nariño and Meta only). It also has two experts in organization, financing, programming, and evaluation assigned to them by the United Nations.

Promotion

The División has established contact with approximately 4,743 Juntas de Acción Comunal to whom it has loaned assistance in organization of practical functioning, obtaining of legal recognition (personería jurídica), and coordinating the assistance given by National, International, and Municipal entities. Tangible activities of these Juntas have been numerous, especially in the construction of roads and school rooms.

Training and technical development

One of the most important activities of the División has been the presentation of Acción Comunal courses in order to teach the principals of Community Development to all levels. During 1964 there were 67 formal courses given throughout Colombia to persons representing all sectors of Colombian life (teachers, farmers, 4-H club members, priests, etc.). The publication of materials also forms an important part in the development of communities. For this purpose the División has utilized the services of various Ministries as well as private organizations. In addition, it has several films available on Community Development plus a regular weekly 15-minute televised program.

General evaluation of the program

A special department is devoted exclusively to making basic studies and obtaining statistical information of Community Development in Colombia. From these studies improved methods of work can be introduced.

III. PRESENT STATUS OF ACCION COMUNAL

For the purpose of a more thorough explanation, the structure of Acción Comunal in this Report is broken down into three categories

- A. Organization
- B. Personnel
- C. Budgets

Organization

The División is under Dr. Vicente Pizano Restrepo who has been its Director since the creation of the División. Under Doctor Pizano there is a Sub-Director who acts as a liaison with the various governmental agencies. There are three sections which carry out the field activities of the División. These sections are:

Promotion and Coordination: Presently under the direction of Dr. Jorge Bechara Hernandez. The functions of this particular section are to stimulate, supervise and evaluate community organization and their subsequent activities. It coordinates the functions of the community with those of public and private entities for the promotion of community development. In the event of catastrophes such as floods, earthquakes, landslides, this section must provide im-

mediate relief to the area. It is within the jurisdiction of this section to evaluate the work of regional and local promotores and to recommend transfers, dismissals, and promotions. It must also provide the guidelines for promotores and set up systems and norms of operation. Field visitations are made by the section chief in order to effect the above responsibilities.

Planning and Investigation: Presently directed by Dr. Humberto Triana y Antorversa. While its responsibilities are not very defined, generally it is the investigative body of Acción Comunal that helps collect data on such things as the structures and the different levels of community life in regions where local promotores work. It also seeks information on the activities of the Juntas de Acción Comunal and other community organizations. It evaluates the general program plan of the División de Acción Comunal and prepares the annual report pertaining to the División. As a subsequent result of its investigations it assists in the planning of future community programs. This section works very closely with the United Nations evaluators in an attempt to determine work methods and their improvement.

Investigation and Technical Development: Headed by Dr. Rafael Melgarejo. In order to improve the quality of promotores and Acción Comunal courses, this section is constantly seeking ways and methods of training personnel and improving teaching materials. At present this section is very involved in the training of some 96 candidates for local promotores now receiving classes at the Escuela Superior de Administración Pública (ESAP). This is an eight month training program, which involves field practice for a period of two months. Candidates generally come from the lower and middle economic classes throughout the country. They normally belong to local Juntas de Acción Comunal and have been selected by the Junta because of their natural leadership qualities. At the end of this eight month training program, those who complete the course successfully will be assigned to areas as local promotores.

The División also receives assistance from Doctors Alyos Keune and Jorge Videla of the United Nations who are evaluators and experts on organization, financing, and program development. These two men work closely with each of the above mentioned section chiefs and the Director, Dr. Pizano.

Personnel

Since the very beginning of the Peace Corps Program in Colombia, it was felt that the most effective way of establishing permanent inroads in Community Development would be to have Volunteers work in conjunction with local promotores of Acción Comunal. The first contingent of Volunteers had local promotores as counterparts in some cases and a beginning had been attempted. This phase of close cooperation slowly began to diminish for many reasons, but due mostly to the rapidly accelerated growth of Peace Corps operations in Colombia, as opposed to the static position of Acción Comunal which was beset by financial problems. Dr. Pizano has been constantly waging an offensive effort to have the Colombian Government give the División the much needed financial assistance and personnel that it requires.

With the arrival of new groups of Volunteers, the staff of Peace Corps and CARE/Peace Corps began to take on greater administrative and supervisory responsibilities. In the process the relationship between the División de Acción Comunal and Peace Corps took on aspects of formal acceptance without benefit of utilizing resources pertinent to both organizations. Dr. Pizano would approve all proposed new groups of Volunteers, give them a welcoming speech on the role of Acción Comunal upon arrival, and the con-

tact after that was minimal except for occasional staff meetings.

Obviously, the biggest drawback that the División has had is a lack of sufficient personnel to meet the demands of the job. At this point the organization is top heavy by comparison since there are only 39 promotores locales and approximately 15 people in the central office in Bogotá. With the anticipated increase in operational funds in 1965, it is hoped that by the end of this year the number of local promotores will be increased to approximately 104.

Budgets

The División has access to monies that are classified under three different budgets:

- 1) Administrative or Operational Budget
- 2) Supplementary Budget
- 3) Investment or Development Budget

The *Administrative Budget* is in the amount of Ps. 1,700,000 and is solely for the purpose of meeting administrative costs and payrolls. It is obviously insufficient and limits the proposed growth of the División. Of the above amount approximately Ps. 700,000 are designated for training purposes and are presently being utilized to provide training which include the living expenses of 96 candidates who are enrolled in an eight month training course at ESAP.

The *Supplementary Budget* of Ps. 2,000,000 is a fund designated for the use of the Caja Agraria in agricultural projects hopefully through Acción Comunal. It is the hope of the División to be able to have these monies approved for direct administration and operational costs which would permit it to expand in terms of personnel and services. The request for the transfer of these funds is presently before President Valencia for his consideration and approval.

There is a third source of funds available to Acción Comunal which is incorporated as a part of the *National Budget* for Investments. A specific sum of \$59 million pesos within the overall budget will be used for fostering community projects. The major part of this money (\$43 million pesos) will be channeled through Caminos Vecinales for eventual disbursement to unspecified Juntas. Fourteen million pesos are destined for end use by specific Juntas. The balance (\$2 million pesos) belong to the Caja Agraria intended for agricultural projects but is presently being requested by Acción Comunal for their administrative purposes.

Funds are designated in the following manner. A Junta submits a request through their local promoter; he, in turn, submits it to the Regional Promotor who presents it to the Committee of Caminos Vecinales (committee composed of Jefe Regional of Caminos Vecinales, Regional Promotor of Acción Comunal, Secretary of Public Works, Secretary of Agriculture and a Representative of the Private Sector). Upon approval by the Committee funds are sent direct to local Junta treasurer.

IV. ASPECTS ON INTEGRATION

A Decree that will determine the future expansion of Acción Comunal is presently before the President of Colombia awaiting approval. Essentially this becomes a matter of establishing new Governmental positions. First, the jobs or positions must be "created", which is done by the approval of the President and/or Congress. Secondly, the people to fill these new positions must be appointed—an act officially done by the Ministry of Government based upon recommendations made by the División of Acción Comunal. Thirdly, the distribution of work areas including the sites for new promotores are designated. This responsibility falls under the Section of Promotion and Coordination of the División of Acción Comunal.

This Decree will not only create new positions, but will also permit the use of the

fund mentioned previously of some \$2 million pesos to cover the expenses involved. With these additional funds the División is also planning to purchase approximately 18 vehicles for use in the program.

Previously the División of Acción Comunal had not been a part of the Civil Service system of the Government. With the restructuring of positions, every employee of the División will be given Civil Service Exams and must be approved by the Board. The employee will then be on a 90-day probation period before having permanent employee status.

The old and new positions can best be explained graphically by the accompanying charts (attachment I, II, III), as well as the potential counterpart relationship with CARE/Peace Corps.

A. Integration as a reality

Total integration of Community Development programs under the División of Acción Comunal will involve many new responsibilities and some changes. The staff and field personnel of both organizations would seek a common program approach as a *modus operandi*. Perhaps it would be best to state the comparative organizational structure at this point.

At the state level, both Central and regional, it would mean sharing the same or adjoining offices in order to plan and coordinate programs jointly. The decision making responsibility would be discussed and shared since they would affect both the Volunteers and Local Promotores. A mutual criteria for both the Volunteers and Promotores Locales would be established to avoid conflicts of interest wherever possible. At the present time CARE/Peace Corps has regional offices in Barranquilla, Medellín, Bucaramanga and Cali. Each office has the responsibility of between 3 to 5 Departments (attachment II). Acción Comunal on the other hand has regional offices in 17 Departments plus 39 Local Promotores scattered throughout the country.

In Bogotá CARE/Peace Corps has an American staff of 3 persons to carry out all administrative functions pertaining to some 232 Volunteers. This, of course, is without benefit of resources to do investigative studies such as the effect of Peace Corps Volunteers in rural communities; or governmental agencies—their functions and potential assistance to Community Development. By comparison the División of Acción Comunal has three Departments dealing with promotion and coordination, investigation and planning, and technical development (specific responsibilities previously stated). The División has seven administrative staff members to direct these functions and will add another two to three staff members in the near future. This is in addition to the two United Nations advisors.

The value of these Departments is unquestionable and their value to Peace Corps via an integrated approach can result in establishing community development programs based on factual studies and more realistic appraisals of situations.

Another factor for consideration is the continuity that would be added to the program through integration. It is a rare opportunity to assist a Nation in the full-scale development of its manpower resources. One of the most common questions asked by Volunteers is "What happens after I leave?" If, through integration, we can strengthen the existing structure of Community Development we will be providing the answer to this question. Our expressed desire for integration is an indication of belief that Community Development is an integral part of the overall development of the Nation.

B. Joint operational structure

Preliminary discussions with the División of Acción Comunal have been held and both organizations seem to agree on the chain

of command structure although this must await further concrete discussions. For reference the joint operational lines of authority are indicated in attachment III.

The greater percentage of Volunteers at the present time do not have official counterparts. With the advent of integration a large part of the Volunteers would work jointly with Colombian promotores which would give them an advantage in the language, learning the customs and in dealing with governmental entities. Arrangements would have to be made as to areas of work and also responsibilities since the local promoter and the Volunteer would be at the same level of job responsibility. At the Departmental level the National División will assign Promotores Seccionales (Departamentales) who would work in conjunction with Volunteer Leaders and who would have under their direct responsibilities the Local Promotores. The new positions created would be those of the Jefes Zonales who would correspond to the Regional Directors of the CARE/Peace Corps organization and possibly 17 Regional Assistants (footnote attachment III). At the Divisional Headquarters level the Acción Comunal Director and CARE/Peace Corps Director would share the responsibilities of direction. At the top of the organizational structure Peace Corps assumes overall planning and supervision as does the National Department of Planning and Technical Support in conjunction with the Ministry of Government.

This report was written for the narrow purposes of urging closer integration of Peace Corps and Acción Comunal, for circulation among people familiar with both program efforts. I regret it is not more detailed. The State Department is obtaining detailed current information for me from our Embassy in Bogotá. I have requested a copy of an evaluation study made by the United Nations, but not yet cleared by the Government of Colombia. Hopefully, this data will provide a basis for evaluation of the program's performance.

Reports now available, however, support the belief that community action can be a valuable tool in the development of the alliance nations. This vast potential remains untapped. Much can be done to spur its utilization at the meeting of the American Presidents, which will be in session 1 month from today.

It is for this reason that I call the attention of the Congress to this report. According to the Peace Corps, the program has been underfunded and hampered by "lack of sufficient personnel to meet the demands of the job." Despite these limitations, "tangible activities of these juntas have been numerous, especially in the construction of roads and schoolrooms."

Perhaps Acción Comunal can serve as a prototype for similar programs among the nations of the alliance. Certainly, its 8 years of experience deserve evaluation as a possible means of implementing title 9 of the Foreign Assistance Act—section 281—which we added last year.

TWENTY YEARS AFTER THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE: NEITHER WAR NOR PEACE

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of February 21, 1947, the First Secretary of the British Embassy in Washington visited the State Department and handed American officials two notes from His Majesty's Government. One concerned Greece, the other Turkey. In effect, they both stated the same thing: that Britain could no longer meet its traditional responsibilities in those two countries. Since Greece was on the verge of collapse and Turkey about to acquiesce to Soviet demands, the implications of the British notes were clear: that a Soviet breakthrough was imminent and could be prevented only by substantial American commitment.

At that time the Greek rebels, composed mostly of Communist elements, were firmly entrenched in northern Greece and driving toward the coast for complete domination of the country, aided and encouraged by Moscow. Turkey had just been presented with a series of diplomatic notes by the Soviet Foreign Minister which in effect, demanded Turkey relinquish control of the Dardanelles and Turkish Straits to the Soviet Union.

It was an historic afternoon. On that day, Great Britain, the only remaining power in Europe, acknowledged its exhaustion. It had fought Philip II of Spain, Louis XIV of France, Kaiser Wilhelm, and Adolf Hitler of Germany. It had preserved the balance of power, but its ability to continue to protect that balance had been eliminated as a result of economic exhaustion caused by World War II. Now, suddenly, there was no one to protect the balance of power favoring the West but the United States itself; no one stood between this country and Soviet imperialism. All other major powers of the world had collapsed—except the Soviet Union. If Greece, Turkey, and Persia were to maintain their integrity it would have to be with a massive American commitment.

President Truman was quick to recognize this stark fact. On March 12, 1947, 20 years ago, he went before a joint session of Congress and delivered what John Spainer has called "a speech which must rank as one of the most important in American history." President Truman said:

Totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States . . . should we fail to aid Greece and Turkey in this fateful hour, the effect will be far reaching to the West as well as to the East.

Thus began the "Truman doctrine," the policy of containment which was supported by a willingness to use military force to preserve the balance of power. Containment said, in effect, "This far, no farther."

The 20th anniversary of any policy is a good time to stand back and measure its success and failures and to determine present and future needs. To do this we must distinguish reality from myth, but unhappily at this critical period in our relations with the Soviet Union we are beset by three myths which are being promoted as realities. They are:

First. That Communist China—not the Soviet Union—is the greatest threat to our security.

Second. That the Soviet Union is less menacing than earlier, because natural Russian nationalism has replaced Communist ideology as the guiding force of foreign policy. The logical conclusion of this myth is that the Soviet Union is no more a threat than would be a non-Communist Russian Government.

Third. That the newly emerging managerial and technical class is winning political control at the expense of the ideologically oriented Communist Party hierarchy. The managerial class, according to this myth, is the gravedigger of communism, and replacing Communist totalitarianism is a more diplomatic Russia.

These three myths cloud our thinking regarding the Soviet Union and prevent us from appraising Soviet intentions for what they really are. Without serious question the Soviet Union remains the greatest threat to our security, not the Communist Chinese. Even assuming reassertion of the Russian nationalism in the Soviet Union, the alternative is not an attractive one for us based on Russian history. Ideology is still the dominant factor in Soviet planning, and this is in our best interest. However, we must acknowledge that there is no inevitable evolution toward a more democratic government in the Soviet Union because of the emergence of a technical and managerial class.

SOVIET UNION CAUSE OF WORLD WAR II

Current United States-Soviet Union conflict actually began with World War II since that event was the major factor which caused the present balance of power. History has judged, incorrectly in my opinion, that World War II was inevitable as a result of Allied appeasement of Hitler at Munich. While it may well be that had the British and French stood firm against Hitler's demands for the Sudetenland at Munich his ambitions would have been checked, there was, after all, a subsequent last chance to deter Hitler's war in Europe as well as Japan's ambitions to establish a "greater east Asia co-prosperity sphere."

Soviet pacts set the stage for World War II. Germany could not wage war against France and Britain with her eastern flank exposed to the Soviet Union. No geographical boundaries stood between Germany and the Red Armies, only the nation of Poland. Germany had learned as a result of World War I that it could not fight two fronts at the same time and hope to win. Therefore, Germany neutralized the Soviet Union through the nonaggression pact signed in 1939. As a result Hitler could with confidence attack France without fear of Russian intervention. For Stalin's part a war among the non-Communist powers had obvious appeal and the pact's secret protocol divided Eastern Europe between Germany and the Soviet Union.

The situation was similar in the Far East. The Soviet-Japanese nonaggression treaty of 1941 relieved the Japanese Government of concern about a possible war with the Soviet Union, and ended a

state of semiwar which had existed since 1933. It enabled Japan to pursue a more aggressive policy toward the United States, culminating in the attack on Pearl Harbor. Without the Soviet-Japanese pact Japan would have been unlikely to start military operations because its position in China and Manchuria would have been precarious. Like Germany, Japan could not risk a two-front war. Later the Soviet Union joined the Allies following Germany's invasion of Russia and ultimately entered the fight against the Japanese in the closing days of the Pacific war.

Despite heavy material and manpower losses, the Soviet Union emerged as the only real victor of World War II, and contrary to American expectations, the war against the Axis did not usher in an era of peace within the framework of American-Soviet cooperation.

U.S. disillusionment with the Soviet Union rested on the same factors that enabled the Soviet Union to emerge as the second greatest world power. These were:

First. The war had eviscerated or seriously weakened six of the Soviet Union's seven major enemies; namely, Germany, Japan, Italy, Britain, France, and Nationalist China. Their disappearance as great powers removed significant barriers to Soviet expansion and brought into being vacuums in Europe, the Near, Middle, and Far East and southeast Asia—vacuums which the Soviets attempted to fill.

Second. As a result of military maneuvers and the vacuum conditions, the Soviet Union increased greatly its zone of domination through the annexation of territories and the transformation of independent states of Eastern Europe into Soviet satellites.

Third. Political disintegration, economic dislocations, and social chaos caused by the wars provided fertile soil for the cultivation of communism.

The Soviets were equal to the opportunity. Their armies overran Eastern Europe. And the Red army provided security so local Communist parties could win political control. As Jan Librach points out in "The Rise of the Soviet Empire,"¹ this course was not inevitable.

Winston Churchill had argued for an invasion of Europe through southeast Europe at a time when the Russian Army was still 700 miles from Eastern Europe.

Had this course been taken all of Eastern Europe with the possible exception of Yugoslavia—where the Red army was not a major factor in Tito's successful bid for power—would undoubtedly have remained non-Communist. But Roosevelt and Stalin rejected the Churchill proposal. From that point on Soviet domination of Eastern Europe was inevitable.

The West was caught unprepared and did not react effectively until the crisis in Greece at which point the "Truman doctrine" of containment was formulated. It put Greece, Turkey, and Iran off limits to Soviet influence through a

¹ See Jan Librach, "The Rise of the Soviet Empire," New York, 1965, pp. 101-104.

broad show of military force and by economic and military assistance to the Greek Government, then battling for its life.

STRUGGLE BETWEEN STATUS QUO AND
IMPERIALISM BASED UPON IDEOLOGY

The policy of containment was based upon an understanding of international politics as a power struggle² based upon ideology. In it the forces seeking to maintain the present distribution of power compete with imperialism seeking to upset the status quo.

The Truman doctrine sought to maintain the 1946 status quo in Europe based on the conferences of the war held at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam. The Soviet Union sought to upset to its advantage this distribution of power.

The policy of containment did not seek to roll back the progress which communism had already achieved—although this would have been justified because the Soviets had already violated the conference agreements by subverting free elections.

Critics of the policy have maintained that the Soviet Union no longer was an imperialistic power in the world sense, but sought local preponderance. After all, they argued, Stalin's design on Greece was in keeping with Russian history. Non-Communist Russia had always had as traditional objectives control of Finland, Eastern Europe, the Balkans, the Dardanelles, and Iran. Thus, said the critics, the United States overreacted because the Soviet leaders acted as would have any non-Communist czar. They said we mistook a traditional Russian policy for Communist imperialism, and therein our troubles started. The United States resorted to certain measures, defensive in intent, such as armaments, bases, and alliances. The Soviet Union in turn resorted to countermeasures interpreting the U.S. moves as imperialism. These countermeasures strengthened the initial concern on the part of the United States. The critics of our policy said in such circumstances both countries must correct their policy errors or else ever-increasing mutual suspicions, feeding upon each other, will end in war. Their argument has gained currency because of the advent of nuclear weapons and the indiscriminate, universal destruction that is associated with them.

Their assumptions, of course, are based on the erroneous premise that the Soviet Union was actually not an imperialistic power. Admittedly the problem of detection was great. How can a policy of conquest which operates within the existing status quo be distinguished from one which seeks to overthrow it? The individual imperialistic steps in themselves are often ambiguous and, therefore, do not reveal the actual nature of the policy of which they form the parts. This problem is aggravated by the fact that a policy which starts out seeking adjustments within the status quo may change character because

of either success or frustration. The ease with which the original objectives are reached within the established order may suggest to the expanding nation, in this case the Soviet Union, that it is dealing with weak or irresolute opponents and that a change in the existing power relations can be achieved without great effort or risk.

A nation, on the other hand, which is frustrated in its objectives may seek more dramatic means to change the power relations. Actually the differences between the Soviet Union and the United States are real. Neither is suffering from hallucinations reciprocally induced by staring at one another through a distorting pane they have mistaken for plate glass.

In my judgment President Truman correctly guessed that the Soviet Union was embarking upon a policy of imperialism. Events already underway in Eastern Europe showed the Soviets would not permit the establishment of independent governments. They insisted upon governments which they could dominate. They could have regarded the victory over Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and the Japanese Empire, in alliance with the nondictatorial capitalist countries of Western Europe and the United States, as removing once and for all the danger of lawlessness and aggression in international affairs.

They could have, as J. M. Mackintosh³ argues, interpreted the situation as calling for the maintenance of the alliance with the countries of the West in order to concentrate all their efforts on the rehabilitation of devastated Russia and the development of the economic power of the Soviet Union.

They could have developed the spirit of Soviet-American cooperation in world affairs that President Roosevelt hoped would come to pass.

Soviet leaders instead interpreted their position of tremendous strength as the vindication of all that Stalin and Lenin had prophesied. They treated Europe and Asia not as a sphere for rehabilitation but as an area ripe for revolutionary takeover. Their imperialistic designs were obviously motivated by Communist ideology which called for the expansion of communism.

President Truman realized that to the extent that Communist parties gained influence, by whatever means, in a particular nation, Soviet influence there increased. Where Communist parties actually gained control, the Soviet Government through its control of the Communist parties actually controlled those national governments. It was for that reason that the Soviet Union attempted to overthrow Tito and expel China from the Communist movement. Control of the international Communist movement was of prime importance for, implicit in the Marxian theory of historical determinism, whoever controls the Communist parties will eventually control the world. Thus the Soviet Union could not tolerate an interloper.

The success of the Truman contain-

ment policy in preventing overt aggression is clearly established. Dr. Harold Hinton describes the success of containment in these words:

American containment . . . has been a major factor in inflaming the Sino-Soviet dispute and in fact in bringing down both Stalin and Khrushchev.

But the containment policy has not always been successful in reducing Communist subversion—as in the case of Czechoslovakia in 1948—nor has it eliminated the ultimate goal of the Communists: world domination. It has indeed prevented overt aggression or a general war, but it has not produced any significant reduction in Soviet reliance on secrecy or in charge from its long-term objectives. The underlying causes of conflict do not yet appear to have been substantially reduced because the Soviet Union still retains its imperialist ambition.

SUCCESS OF CONTAINMENT POLICY RECOGNIZED
BY SOVIET UNION IN 1956

By remaining firm in our political demands and by utilizing nonmilitary pressures—trade concessions, for example—to their maximum, we can frustrate the Soviet Union's aggressive policies and bring about some desirable changes. Firmness and pressure will not provoke a military first strike against us so long as we maintain an edge on the Soviets in military preparedness and technology.

Checkmated from any natural instincts to retaliate, the Soviets may well choose to pursue instead areas of joint agreement and cooperation. Even as we maintain vigilance and preparedness, we must also stand ready to take full advantage of such opportunities.

The high water mark of containment came with Khrushchev's "secret speech" to the 20th Congress of the CPSU in which he declared that war with capitalist states was no longer inevitable. Chairman Khrushchev clearly saw that the United States would fight to preserve the balance-of-power conflict and the Soviet Union would lose. Khrushchev needed a policy to answer containment which would protect the Soviet base of communism, but permit gradual progress toward what he considered the eventual triumph of communism.

His answer was "peaceful coexistence" which he described in these terms:

Co-existence means continuation of the struggle between the social systems, but by peaceful means, without war, without interference by one state in the internal affairs of another. We consider it to be an economic, political, and ideological struggle but not military.

Thus he ruled out war in its traditional form. The Soviet Union could not impose its will by overt aggression. It stood too much to lose. The year 1956 marked the final Soviet acknowledgment, short of a successful first strike against the United States, that containment was a success in preserving the balance of power. But the Chairman had an answer to containment: "peaceful coexistence" and now 10 years later we are beginning to see that this new policy has become almost as successful in advancing communism as containment has been in preventing overt aggression.

² For a description of international politics as a power struggle see Hans J. Morgenthau, "Politics Among Nations," third edition, New York, 1960, pp. 27-101.

³ J. M. Mackintosh, "Strategy and Tactics of Soviet Foreign Policy," New York, 1963, p. 4.

"Peaceful coexistence" began as a temporary and fluctuating tactic but has since become a long-range strategy of the Soviet leadership. Its five principal characteristics are:

First, the struggle for Communist ascendancy must continue, without change in ultimate aims or any thought of compromise except to meet short-term problems.

Second, overt war is to be avoided but not ruled out. Even though Khrushchev asserted the Soviets could win a general war, it is questionable whether he really believed it.

Third, the West must be persuaded to a "noninterference" policy—which means to drop talk of rolling back communism, captive nations, self-determination, and free elections. The Western powers must accept communism as irreversible wherever it is now in control, and not interfere with the local growth of communism in other parts of the world. Struggle, of course, is to take place only in noncommunized areas. Communist areas, for obvious reasons, are clearly out of bounds.

Fourth, threat of war is to be used as a valid instrument for political advance. Since 1956 the Soviet Union has threatened military action against Turkey, Pakistan, Norway, Italy, Britain, France, West Germany, and even the United States.

Fifth, nonpeaceful action is used to protect a Communist regime from attack, and to support by any means just wars of national liberation. Soviet leadership, of course, retains the right to decide which wars are just.

The five-edged policy of peaceful coexistence is accomplished through various ideological appeals and through the devices of war by proxy, civil wars, and coups d'etat.

Since 1963 the Soviets have refined peaceful coexistence to the point where it now includes even the possibility of a detente. And in a meaningless detente lies our gravest danger.

WE ATTEMPT TO MEET PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE WITH MYTHS

Without fully appreciating the full implications of peaceful coexistence, numerous critics of containment, both in and out of the Government, have advanced the thesis that the Soviet Union is no longer bent on world domination, and the Soviet claim of this goal is dismissed as meaningless rhetoric. They argue that we must now treat the Soviet Union just as though it were a non-Communist state with only natural nationalistic interests and assign to her certain spheres of influence. Implicit in this argument is the idea that the United States should restrict its own role as a world power. It should quit trying to stop communism in every corner of the globe. It should pull back and instead restrict its primary role to dominance in North and South America.

MYTHS REGARDING THE SOVIET UNION

To justify U.S. withdrawal they accept the myth that it is Communist China which is our principal enemy, not the Soviet Union. Indeed, some even suggest that the United States and the So-

viet Union join as allies against the common foe China.

If Communist China actually possessed the high degree of military technology and the nuclear arsenal of the Soviet Union then it would probably be the greatest threat to our security, but it does not. Although China may well have the goal of destroying us, it does not yet have the means. The fact that the Soviets are a little more subtle in their pronouncements regarding their eventual triumph over us does not mean they are less willing to use suitable means to achieve the goals. The Soviet Union has both the goal and the means. One need look no further than Vietnam to seek confirmation of this state of affairs. The Communist Chinese daily criticize U.S. intervention in Vietnam and threaten us with war, but their bark is worse than their bite.

Contrast this with the position of the Soviet Union which claims it is seeking a peace settlement, but without Soviet equipment and arms, North Vietnam's ability to infiltrate South Vietnam would be greatly limited. The Soviet Union has supplied North Vietnam with numerous Mig fighters, SAM missiles, anti-aircraft guns, tanks, and armored cars and millions of dollars in economic assistance, not to mention effective and enthusiastic political support.

Critics of containment also accept the myth that Communist ideology is no longer a guiding force in Soviet foreign policy, and therefore, we need not be obsessed with leading an anti-Communist crusade.

Finally, they accept the myth that the Soviet Union is evolving into a more responsible member of the world community because her people are gaining some degree of freedom, and the newly emerging managerial class is vying successfully with the party hierarchy for control of the government.

It is argued that the Soviet Union is in the midst of profound, inevitable and hopeful transformations. As it produces more consumer goods, it will become less ideological, less militant, and increasingly concerned with material comfort. As Soviet citizens get better standards of living and develop a greater stake in their society, so the argument goes, they will exert increasing pressure for the freedoms long enjoyed and cherished by the West. Industrialization requires technical skills and education fosters a questioning spirit, and they say the managerial class will effectively resist pressures of a police state as time goes on.

These critics hold that the extension of individual liberty and popular self-government are almost inevitable companions of economic development.

This opinion is widely held in high State Department circles. Zbigniew Brzezinski, a key State Department adviser for Soviet affairs and a member of the planning council, has written:

Development and maturity render dictatorship of any sort . . . historically obsolescent.

A nongovernmental commentator, Adam Ulam, uses even stronger terms:

The natural process in the U.S.S.R. must be one of erosion of totalitarianism.

Statements similar to these from high officials and certain Russian scholars could be quoted endlessly.

Those who hold these views believe that the rate and direction of political change are influenced by increased education, increased economic welfare, and increased occupational specialization. Thus, "technological complexity will strengthen the managerial class at the expense of the ideologists and militants."

This theory cannot be proved absolutely to be either true or false, but several critical observations can be made.

First, historical inevitability is actually a substitute for effort. By this belief, we rely for the solution of our problems on an evolutionary theory in which the assumed forces of history have replaced purpose and action. In my view, evidence is to the fact that purpose and action—not evolution—actually mold policy. Although changes in Soviet policies often result largely from forces over which the West has little control, they are also in part a Soviet reaction to Western policies. The external condition which has most influenced the evolution of Soviet policy in the direction of restraint has been a firm resistance to Soviet probes—as in Berlin and Cuba—combined with the demonstrated political and economic vitality of the non-Communist world.

It may be that there is some evidence of a Russian nationalism replacing communist ideology on the basis of decision-making in the Soviet Union, but it is hardly substantial. In any event the reemergence in the Soviet Union of the Russian legacy rather than Communist ideology does not in and of itself hold much comfort to the West. Imperial Russia in its day was about as autocratic and imperialistic as modern-day Russia. Russia never knew a renaissance, reform, or age of enlightenment. In their place were absolutism and orthodoxy. Imperial Russia desired a vast empire under its domination. It sought to extend influence into Europe, the Middle East, Africa, the Far East, and even into North America. The main difference was that czarist Russia lacked the strength of Soviet Russia. In this respect an evolution toward a Russian character rather than a Communist one is hardly appealing.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT NO GUARANTEE OF A MODERATE FOREIGN POLICY

Nor is the record hopeful regarding the relationship between economic development and a moderate foreign policy, between education and a questioning spirit. Industrial advance did not make Germany less militant, and a superior rate of economic development in the 1930's did not make Japan peaceful. Indeed an industrial capacity and a highly developed economy are necessities for any successful aggressive foreign policy. Regarding education, we must not forget that for many centuries and in many societies education served the function of indoctrination. The educational system of Germany during pre-World War II days, as Henry Kissinger has observed, was one of the most advanced in the world. Yet its support of the Hitler regime far outweighed its re-

sistence to it. Education in itself does not necessarily produce enlightened political action.

In the Soviet Union one of the major obstacles to political progress was the systematic Soviet attempt to integrate the ablest individuals into the existing order through preferment, indoctrination, propaganda, and, if necessary, pressure. By constantly recruiting the most talented into its ranks, the Communist hierarchy deprived any opposition of its potential leadership.

Does the managerial class temper the rule of the party hierarchy? Jeremy R. Azrael has concluded in his "Managerial Power and Soviet Politics," that the premise is without historical support:

Although theories of political development which cast the engineers and managers in the role of foreordained "gravediggers of Communism" have been common for over fifty years, they have found little confirmation in events. At almost every step, the technicians have bowed to the dictates of the ruling elite, and, in those cases where they have proved somewhat recalcitrant, their resistance has ultimately been futile.

That the "gravedigger" interpretation of the political role of the Soviet managerial elite has remained so widespread and so intellectually respectable in the face of such overwhelming counterevidence is graphic testimony to the powerful hold that economic determinism exercises over modern political analysis.

To deny that the primacy of politics has so far been the rule in the development of the Soviet system is to fly in the face of the available evidence.

It is doubtful that any other system has been characterized by so low a correlation between its level of actual freedom and what might be called its level of potential freedom, as measured by economic resources, educational capacity, technical capabilities and such. Potentially, the Soviet Union compares favorably with other industrialized societies and outranks most nations of the world. But the opportunities that might have been used to expand the arena of liberty have been used to keep it narrowly restricted and subject to constant encroachment.

The observations of Mr. Azrael are bitter news for those who believe in historical inevitability under which industrialization and emerging managerial and technical classes will lead to the moderation of the Soviet regime. Yet as long as the economic sphere of the Soviet Union affords a reasonable degree of freedom—sufficient to permit concentration on output and efficiency—the managerial group is not likely to insist upon political participation.

This is precisely the situation in the Soviet Union today, and it supports observations made by Henry Kissinger that the success of economic development, cultural prestige, and political power enhances the prestige of the form of government promoting it. A Russian seeing the growth of the Communist empire over the last 20 years and the significant Soviet contributions in the field of literature, the arts, science, and technology would not automatically conclude that its system of political organization was basically wrong.

This is not to say that evolution in Communist societies is impossible. On the contrary it is inevitable. No system of government is immune to change. No

country has ever maintained an unaltered social structure, but the nature of the transformation is by no means foreordained.

It can refine the tools of slavery. There may even be in Russia a degree of liberalization, but it will be a liberalization of a Communist regime, not an evolution toward a democratic one. What little freedom exists in the Soviet Union is at best residual and highly vulnerable. It is as precarious as it is precious. Equally important, of course, is the time scale by which it occurs. It was, after all, no consolation for Carthage that 150 years after its conquest by Rome, the latter was transformed into a status quo power, with no capacity to threaten its neighbors.

Another major myth upon which it is being argued we should establish detente with the Soviet Union is the belief that ideology is no longer a guiding force there—that the Soviet leaders preside over a country, not a cause and their perceptions and decisions are based on pragmatism, not preconceptions.

It would be foolhardy to downgrade ideology as a force in international politics, especially the ideology of communism. The struggle that splits the world today, the clash between totalitarianism and individual liberty is fundamentally an ideological struggle for power. To dismiss this ideology as a collection of ad hoc rules is to fly in the face of history. For under no political system has theory been assigned so important a place as under communism. Nowhere else do doctrinal differences lead to political strife of such magnitude, including open violence. In the name of correct interpretation of Marxism-Leninism, Trotsky was banished and later assassinated; Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Rykov were tried and executed; Molotov, Kaganovich, Malenkov, and Bulganin were consigned to political oblivion. Differing interpretations of ideology are believed to be the basis of the Sino-Soviet split. It is the factor that gives long-term consistency to the seemingly day-by-day inconsistency of Soviet foreign policy.

For three reasons we should view with comfort the continuation of ideology as a force in Soviet politics, for it is the very importance of ideology that gives the West an edge in the current struggle against communism.

These are the reasons:

First. Since the Soviet ideology is less militant than the Chinese variety, the Soviets are under an obligation to articulate, defend, and prove the fundamental assumptions upon which their strategy of peaceful coexistence is based. The heart of this concept is the belief that war is no longer inevitable. Therefore, the principal reason for the Soviet interest in a detente with the West is the Sino-Soviet split which is based on an ideological struggle as well as a struggle for domination of the world Communist movement.

Second. Ideology serves as a long-range goal or vision for the Soviet decisionmaker, and makes Soviet retreat in the face of Western demands justifiable and even defensible. Communists assume the world moves toward their goal.

Soviet ideologies claim the world under communism is inevitable, no matter what setbacks and retreats are incurred, and this injects enough self-confidence into the Soviet decisionmaker to make setbacks acceptable. Thus, retreat is possible, indeed sometimes even ideologically justifiable because an identification with progress and history, and a flexibility in the choice of means is possible so long as the ends are constant.

Third. An imperialistic power like the Soviets must have an ideological justification to change the status quo. Imperialism must prove that the status quo it seeks to overthrow deserves to be overthrown, and that the moral legitimacy which in the minds of many attaches to things as they are, brought to yield to a higher principle or morality calling for a new distribution of power. Thus the burden of proof is upon the Soviet Union to support the necessity for a change in the balance of power.

This third use of ideology is obscure because the Soviet Union pretends to advance the ideology of a status quo power, which includes peace and international law. Peace can preserve the status quo, and law—primarily a static force—defines the present distribution of power and offers standards and processes to maintain it. Peace also permits non-violent changes in the status quo consistent with international law.

Examples are the United Nations and the World Court. Peace is advanced as the ideology of Soviet imperialism. Fear of a third world war fought with modern weapons of mass destruction—Khrushchev said the living would envy the dead—is so widespread that no government can expect to gain support for its foreign policies from its own and other peoples if it cannot convince them of its peaceful intentions. Consequently, the Soviets have embraced the ideology of peace.

These professions of peace have two important political functions. They tend to conceal the actual policies pursued and they tend to attract the support of men of good will. Among those attracted, of course, are people in the country which is the intended victim. We are seeing this phenomenon in our country today.

Twenty years of heavy defense spending, foreign aid, the loss of thousands of lives in Korea and Vietnam have had their impact. The cost in blood and treasure has been so great and the burdens so unfairly distributed that many people are willing and anxious to reduce our worldwide responsibilities at the first hopeful sign of a relaxation in world tensions.

But it is not only in our country that the Soviet peace campaign has been effective in a disrupting sort of way. It has been seized upon avidly by many Britons who fear that rearmament will lead to bankruptcy, by Frenchmen who may be seeking new excuses to hamper German rearmament, and by Germans who seek monetary gain through expanding business with Soviet Russia and its satellites.

The Soviet profession of peace is obviously a mask hiding true Soviet intentions, because the United States and the

Soviet Union have expressed their objectives in almost the identical terms of peace. Both have proclaimed that they have no territorial ambitions beyond the line of military demarcation which was established by the agreements of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Both claim they want to see free and democratic governments established everywhere; that they are guided only by considerations of security and national defense; and that it is the imperialism of the other side against which they are compelled, in spite of their own wishes, to arm.

Examination of myth versus reality shows the true Soviet intentions. In the first place, communism refers to itself as a peaceful movement, but those in East and West Germany, North and South Vietnam, East and West Berlin, and South Korea know it to be a dividing force.

While some think of it as peace, it is really a mockery of peace.

Communism calls itself defensive, but those in Tibet, Hungary, Korea, and Laos know it is aggressive.

Communism proclaims a welcome, but thousands flee it each week across the Berlin wall, the Austrian frontier, and into Hong Kong.

Some call it the inevitable wave of the future, but others know it to be a plot to alter the future.

To some it appears to be a perfectly normal way of life, while others know it is a system where every man is watched closely and where secrecy, deceit, treachery, and oppression are the stock in trade. Colonel Penkovsky reported that among the Soviet elite, life is a study in debauchery, selfishness, and callousness.

Some favor it as a better life, but millions know it as the end of life.

The 20 years of the Truman doctrine of containment may be viewed from at least two points of view. There are at least two possible verdicts. Either containment helped to preserve freedom and keep the peace, which in turn strengthened the legal and moral foundations of international society—and thus served our cause by halting Soviet aggression; or, insofar as it influenced events and may have been the basis for mutual misunderstandings, it contributed to the tensions and instabilities of the world, to the onset of a kind of never-ending crisis.

In my judgment the true verdict is somewhere in between. Since containment the world has not had a world war, but neither has it had world peace. It halted Soviet aggression, but did not prevent Soviet subversion. We must now seek to convince the Soviets that subversion will not work in the 1960's and the 1970's anymore than nuclear blackmail and threats of war worked during the two decades just passed.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIX MEN FROM STATE OF MARYLAND DIE FIGHTING COMMUNISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 126 young men from the State of Maryland have died since January 1966, fighting Communist aggression and defending freedom in Vietnam.

These young men might have gone on to complete their educations, to have children, and to enjoy the same good life as all of us here at home.

I wish to pay tribute to these servicemen—many of them really only boys—who have given the only lives they will ever have in a far-off land. I salute their grieving families, who have lost young men of such loyalty and devotion to duty.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the list of names of these sons of Maryland, so that the memory of their courage will live on in the RECORD of the Congress which owes them such a debt of gratitude.

The list follows:

SGT Robert L. Posey, Jr., son of Mr. Robert L. Posey, Sr., Chesapeake Mobile Homes Court, Lot # 14, Church Road, Hanover.

1LT Charles S. Hymers, son of Lt Col and Mrs. Charles S. Hymers, c/o Maj Kenneth Thierer, 303 Homewood Road, Linthicum Heights.

SP4 Rodger C. Snyder, son of Mr. and Mrs. Sidney J. Snyder, 3423 Courtleigh Drive, Baltimore.

LCPL Kenneth L. Deavers, Jr., son of Mr. Kenneth L. Deavers, Sr., Route # 2, Williamsport.

MSG Harold E. Stiger, husband of Mrs. Maria Stiger, 114 Gerald Road, Munsen Heights, Severn.

PFC Charles C. Harding, son of Mrs. Margaret L. Harding, 3012 Elliott Street, Baltimore.

PFC Jerry P. Setzer, husband of Mrs. Evelyn L. Setzer, 4116 Doris Avenue, Baltimore.

SGT Donald R. Dorman, son of Mrs. Olive M. Quillen, 3517 Madison Place, West Hyattsville.

CPL William M. Branock, son of Mr. and Mrs. John P. Branock, 5320 Taylor Street, Bladensburg.

SP4 Enoch Johnson, son of Mrs. Ruby Johnson, 815 North Eden Street, Baltimore.

PFC William C. Dayton, son of Mr. and Mrs. James A. Dayton, RFD # 2, Cambridge. Maj. Richard H. Lowery, husband of Mrs. Margaret C. Lowery, 109 Forest Street, Cumberland.

PVT Dennis J. Hamet, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Hamet, 5011 Hamilton Avenue, Baltimore.

PFC Harold J. King, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold J. King Sr., 7120 Roslyn Avenue, Derwood.

PFC William D. Graves, son of Mrs. Alice Smith, 7605 Greenleaf Road, Kentland.

SSG James A. Messick, husband of Mrs. Theresa Messick, 307 Sharon Drive, Pasadena.

SGT Angus N. Jackson, husband of Mrs. Myra Jackson, 817 West Ostend Street, Baltimore.

CPL James B. Cannington, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. James B. Cannington, Sr., 1914 Lark Hall, Baltimore.

SSG James N. Byers, husband of Mrs. Patricia Byers, 128 Liberty Street, Westminster.

SP5 Morgan E. Savage, son of Mr. George E. Savage, c/o Mrs. Anna M. Skinner, 2413 North Stockton Street, Baltimore.

PFC William Shover, son of Mr. and Mrs. Howard Shover, 807 Unetta Avenue, Baltimore.

PFC Stephen M. Dydynski, son of Mr. and Mrs. John A. Dydynski, 7503 24th Avenue, Hyattsville.

1st Sgt Melvin G. Davis, husband of Mrs. Melvin G. Davis, 810 Monroe Street, Apartment #108, Annapolis.

SP4 Raymond L. Elliott, Jr., son of Mr.

Raymond L. Elliott, Sr., RFD, Box 119, Chestertown.

PFC John A. Lambie, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. John A. Lambie, Sr., 1221 Meridene Drive, Baltimore.

SP4 John C. Faidley, son of Mr. Robert L. Faidley, P.O. Box 534, Mt. Savage.

CPL Douglas L. Tracy, husband of Mrs. Douglas L. Tracy, Sharpsburg.

SSG Crawford B. Paris, son of Mr. and Mrs. Walter B. Paris, 6-L Hillside Road, Greenbelt.

PFC Larry M. Barnhill, son of Mr. and Mrs. Rembert L. Barnhill, 7221 Waldman Avenue, Baltimore.

PFC Harry W. Murray, son of Mrs. Laura M. Lynch, 4002 5th Street, Brooklyn.

SSG Donald E. Jackson, husband of Mrs. Donna L. Jackson, 512 East Church Street, Baltimore.

PFC Charles H. Lewis, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Lewis, Sr., House 77, Dixon Avenue, Aberdeen.

PFC August G. Mannion, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. August G. Mannion, Sr., 3615 Elmley Avenue, Baltimore.

SSGT Joseph T. McCreight, husband of Mrs. Joseph T. McCreight, Starlight Farms, Pot Springs, Timonium.

LTC James C. McIntosh, husband of Mrs. Theresa G. McIntosh, 10-10 10th Street, Laurel.

LCPL John S. Hall, son of Mr. and Mrs. James E. Hall, 532 Johannsen Street, Baltimore.

SP4 Carl M. Egolf, son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles W. Egolf, 270 East Green Street, Westminster.

LCPL Howard J. Younger, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Howard J. Younger, Sr., 4404 Asbury Avenue, Baltimore.

PFC Linza Norris, husband of Mrs. Linza Norris, 4220 Colborne Road, Baltimore.

Maj. Gary P. Wratten, husband of Mrs. Shirley A. Wratten, 12 East Granville Drive, Silver Spring.

PFC Wellington M. Donahue, husband of Mrs. Wellington M. Donahue, 508 Baltimore Avenue, Cumberland.

SGT Charles E. Whitefield, son of Mrs. Evelyn Whitefield, 111 McCollough Street, Frostburg.

Capt. Milton F. Smith, husband of Mrs. Cathleen Smith, 8026 Glendale Road, Chevy Chase.

SP4 Wilbert Stewart, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Wilbert Stewart, Sr., 1705 Lamont Street, Baltimore.

PFC Samuel W. Smith, son of Mrs. Dorothy C. Smith, 2460 Joseph Avenue, Baltimore.

1ST LT Adrian F. Purnell, husband of Mrs. Lynn S. Purnell, 14713 Janice Drive, Rockville.

PFC David Wisniewski, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank J. Wisniewski, 4416 Reisterstown Road, Baltimore.

SSG Walter F. Payne, brother of Miss Florine E. Payne, 3051 West North Avenue, Baltimore.

LCPL Robert G. Davidson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Roy R. Davidson, 7897 Cheverly Lane, Glen Burnie.

2DLT Donald W. Rohleder, son of Mr. John F. Rohleder, 5819 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge.

PFC Gary B. Flabbi, son of Mr. and Mrs. Julian J. Flabbi, 5038 East Oliver Street, Baltimore.

A2C Tullie P. Iodice, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Tullie P. Iodice, Sr., 2926 Knoll Acres Drive, Baltimore.

LT Clarence D. Miller, husband of Mrs. Norman J. Miller, c/o Mr. Clarence E. Miller, RFD No. 1, Box 86, Frostburg.

PFC Robert H. Lerner, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Lerner, Ijamsville Rd., Ijamsville.

LCPL Michael T. Defibaugh, son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Defibaugh, 3530 Clifmont Ave., Baltimore.

PFC Atlas J. M. Smay, son of Mrs. Mary W. Smay, 300 Gilmore St., Baltimore.

PFC James H. Duffett, son of Mrs. Francis M. Duffett, 202 S. Bruce St., Baltimore.

PFC Jerome D. McArthur, son of Mr. and Mrs. Dannie McArthur, 210 Walnut Ave., Baltimore.

SGT John F. Sewell, Jr., husband of Mrs. John F. Sewell, Jr., 1002 Bethune Rd.

PFC David B. Aiken, son of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel J. Aiken, 5406 Elsrode Ave., Baltimore.

LCPL Andrew W. Youngkin, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Andrew W. Youngkin, Sr., 5700 "F" St., Capitol Heights.

Capt James D. Stallings, husband of Mrs. Ann P. Stallings, 2505 Kevin Lane, Bowie.

SP4 Robert M. Waters, son of Mr. and Mrs. George D. Waters, Stockton Rd., Phoenix, Md.

CPL Joseph C. Brown, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph R. Brown, Longpoint Box 197, Route #1, Pasadena.

PFC Steven R. Sherman, son of Mr. and Mrs. A. Sherman, 1510 Scaggsville Road, Laurel.

SP/4 Earl Melton, Jr., husband of Mrs. Shirley A. Melton, 1000 East 20th Street, Baltimore.

S/MAJ Richard A. Schaaf, son of Mr. and Mrs. William E. Schaaf, Sr., 5504 Clifton Avenue, Baltimore.

1st Lt. Richard W. Meehan, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank M. Smith, Woodsboro.

PFC Kenneth E. Tasker, son of Mrs. Wilda C. Tasker, Route #1, Box 39, Deer Park.

PVT Richard A. Skinner, husband of Mrs. Richard A. Skinner, 14A Crescent Way, Beltsville.

PFC Steve W. Harris, son of Mrs. Alma V. Ritenour, 307 South Stonestreet Avenue, Rockville.

PFC Charles T. McCorkle, son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles T. McCorkle, Pfeffers Road, Bradshaw.

PFC Bernard E. Curtis, son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas E. Curtis, Valley Lane, Upper Marlboro.

PFC Linwood B. Krug, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Linwood B. Krug, Sr., 2529 Gehb Avenue, Baltimore.

Capt. Humbert R. Versace, son of Colonel and Mrs. Humbert J. Versace, 506 Hazlett Avenue, Baltimore.

S/SGT James E. Wilson, husband of Mrs. Arsenia C. Wilson, 1824 Caroline Street, Baltimore.

SP4 Charles E. Smith, husband of Mrs. Carrie Smith, 9218 Darcy Street, Upper Marlboro.

SP4 Joseph E. Newman, son of Mr. and Mrs. Daniel J. Newman, 6208 Field Street, Seat Pleasant.

PFC Robert W. Ruhl, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Ruhl, 17 Fifth Avenue, Lansdowne.

Cpl. Richard C. Smith, son of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph C. Smith, 516 Ashford Road, Silver Spring.

Pfc. Arthur J. Baylor, son of Mr. and Mrs. William R. Baylor, 130 N. Central Avenue, Baltimore.

Sgt. Thomas W. Muir, husband of Mrs. Carolyn Muir, Route 3, Princess Anne.

Sgt. Irving M. Wilson, Jr., husband of Mrs. Grace Wilson, 220 Dallas Court, Baltimore.

2nd Lieutenant James G. Patzwall, husband of Mrs. Barbara Patzwall, 3113 Dillion Street, Baltimore.

Pfc. Mack D. Stainback, Jr., son of Mr. Mack D. Stainback, Sr., 1243 Winston Avenue, Baltimore.

Pvt. Leonard J. Bocek, son of Mr. and Mrs. Francis Bocek, Sr., 6510 North Point Road, Baltimore.

2nd Lt. Robert E. Taylor, son of Colonel and Mrs. Emerson B. Taylor, 404 Lincoln Avenue, Takoma Park.

A/1c Robert L. Hilton, husband of Mrs. Shirley A. Hilton, 313 Mary Lou Avenue, Glen Burnie.

SP/4 John H. Beauchamp, son of Mr. and Mrs. John B. Beauchamp, Sr., 306 Antioch Avenue, Princess Anne.

L/Cpl. George Hitzelberger, son of Mr. and Mrs. John W. Hitzelberger, 7404 Hammond Avenue, Baltimore.

L/Cpl. Charles N. Rudd, husband of Mrs. Charles N. Rudd, Traller 14, Wright's Traller Village, Aberdeen.

Pvt. Gregory V. Armstead, son of Mrs. Helena F. Goodwin, 3832 Old Frederick Road, Baltimore.

Pfc. Harry M. Morse, husband of Mrs. Donna Morse, 17 Holly Road, Route 5, Pasadena.

Sp/4 Eugene N. Chesley, son of Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Chesley, 1205 Etting Street, Baltimore.

Pfc. David B. Ziegler, son of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Ziegler, 1002 S. Curley Street, Baltimore.

Pfc. Dillard R. Burnley, son of Mr. and Mrs. Harley R. Burnley, 5100½ Emerson Street, Hyattsville.

Pfc. Jesse J. Miller, son of Mrs. Ruth Miller, 2917 Clifton Avenue, Baltimore.

L/Cpl. Lawrence T. Hammond, son of Mrs. Gladys Marie Gardner, RFD 16, Box 170 Baltimore.

Sgt. Ronald H. Chittum, husband of Sp/4 Sharon K. Chittum, WAC Company, Ft. Meade.

Sgt. Richard B. Fieller, husband of Shirley J. Fieller, 1020 University Blvd., Silver Spring, Md.

S. Sgt. Oley N. Adams, husband of Mrs. Margaret Adams, 1009 Chillum Road, Apt No. 101, West Hyattsville, Md.

Sp./4 Frederick A. Phoebus, son of Mr. Calvert I. Phoebus, 2337 McElderry St., Baltimore.

1 Lt. James H. Baker, Jr., son of Mrs. Betty Smith, 5702 Powhattan, Riverdale.

Pfc. Michael A. Garriss, son of Mr. and Mrs. John D. Garriss, 1311 Drew St., Baltimore.

Pfc. Eddie Green, son of Mr. and Mrs. Eddie Green, 105 S. Kossuth St., Baltimore.

Pfc. Paul P. Pennington, son of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Pennington, 233 Baltimore Ave., Baltimore.

L/Cpl. William E. Tucker, son of Mrs. Laura A. Tucker, 324 First Street, Eastport, Annapolis.

L/Cpl. James F. Smallwood, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph R. Smallwood, 4910 Whitfield, Chapel Road, Lanham.

Pfc. James Kennedy, Jr., son of Mr. James Kennedy, Sr., 1320 69th Avenue, Seat Pleasant.

Sp./4 Harry E. Crissey, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry E. Crissey, Sr., 8749 St. Gregory Drive, Baltimore.

Sgt. Gregory B. Norton, son of Mrs. Grace N. Maith, 4702 Garrison Blvd., Baltimore.

HN Robert E. Smith, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Smith, Sr., 350 Park Avenue, Frederick.

2 Lt. John D. Kramer, son of Mr. and Mrs. Claude J. Kramer, 11313 Stephen Lane, Beltsville.

Sgt. Joseph Wilson, son of Mr. Robert Wilson, 1305 Lanvale Street, Baltimore.

Pfc. Richard A. Blanchfield, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Blanchfield, Forge Road, Box 174, Perry Hall.

Sp./4 Norman N. Miller, son of Mr. John E. Miller, 8902 Robin Place, Snow Hill Development Area, Laurel.

L/Cpl. Donald E. Young, son of Mr. Howard Young, 3405 Rolling Road, Baltimore.

PFC Theodore F. Taylor, son of Mrs. Pauline Taylor, Box 112, Chance.

SP/4 George K. Newman, son of Mr. and Mrs. George A. Newman, 1203 Etting Street, Baltimore.

SP/5 Freddie G. Lloyd, son of Mrs. Anna E. Lloyd, 1622 McHenry Street, Baltimore.

PFC Ronald M. Kenny, son of Mr. Charles Kenny, Box 65, Mt. Airy.

PFC James T. Brown, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Brown, 1707 Latrobe Street, Baltimore.

SP/4 James R. Cumberpatch, Jr., son of Colonel and Mrs. James R. Cumberpatch, Sr., 4518 Amberst Lane, Bethesda.

S/SGT Edmund D. Brent, Jr., husband of Mrs. Edmund D. Brent, Jr., 2451 Fairway Rd., Baltimore.

SGT Russell L. Price, husband of Mrs. Virginia B. Price, 2411 Lauretta Avenue, Baltimore.

PFC Lawrence P. Lebrun, son of Mrs. Jeanne L. White, 7F Concord Cove Apartment, Havre de Grace.

S/SGT Charles W. Parsons, husband of Mrs. Daisy B. Parsons, 511 East Booth St., Salisbury.

RESTORATION OF INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the President on his new demonstration of firm-handed guidance of the Nation's economic well-being, I want to draw attention to one aspect of last year's investment boom which is apt to be less than fully appreciated.

When the domestic capital goods industry reached the point of full, indeed almost overfull, utilization of productive capacity, shipments dropped behind new orders, backlogs built up to excessive levels, and U.S. businessmen had to turn to overseas markets in search of equipment suppliers. For the first three quarters of last year, imports of capital goods—excluding trucks and buses—jumped an average of 14 percent a quarter. As a result, in 1966 we increased our spending on imported machinery and equipment by \$850 million over 1965, causing a painful additional drain on the balance of payments—at a time when it was already under pressure from Vietnam costs.

Now this scramble overseas has subsided noticeably, unburdening this unnatural load on our balance of payments.

So the suspension of the investment tax credit last September not only served our domestic markets—kept prices from exploding, introduced order into the machinery industry's labor market, and took the unsustainable supercharge out of the investment boom—it also helped stem the threatening flood in our balance of payments.

The President again deserves our applause—and our support in restoring the investment tax credit.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CORMAN, for today, on account of official business.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. Morgan), for today, and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. RIEGLE (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), through March 16, on account of official business as Presidential delegate to the inauguration of the President-elect of Brazil.

Mr. FIRNIE (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), through March 16, on account of official business.

Mr. ADAIR (at the request of Mr. GER-ALD R. FORD), through March 16, on account of official business.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, March 13-15, on account of official business.

Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. WINN (at the request of Mr. GER-ALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

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. HALL, for 40 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RAILSBACK, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK), for 10 minutes, on Tuesday, March 14; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK), for 20 minutes, on Wednesday, March 15; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALL (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK), for 40 minutes on Wednesday, March 15; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LONG of Maryland (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ST GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY), for 5 minutes, on Tuesday, March 14; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FASCELL, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 14, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1966, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following reports for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85-804:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1967.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is a report to the Congress pursuant to Section 4 of the Act of August 28, 1958, (72 Stat. 972), submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to Rule XL of that House.

During calendar year 1966, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration utilized the authority of the above-cited statute as follows:

1. Extraordinary contractual adjustments authorized by the NASA Contract Adjustment Board:

a. Under date of January 24, 1966, the Board authorized the adjustment of a contract for photographic, reproduction, micro-filming, and related services with Continental Graphics, Inc., Los Angeles, California, in the amount of \$26,079.36. In the same decision, the Board authorized an adjustment of another contract for similar services with the same contractor in an amount approximating \$3,184, the exact amount to be determined upon further audit.

b. Under date of January 27, 1966, the Board authorized the adjustment of a contract for the production and delivery of thermocouples, and the drawings, designs and specifications related thereto with Hy-Cal Engineering Co. of Santa Fe Springs, California, in the total amount of \$6,645.93.

c. Under date of March 23, 1966, the Board authorized the adjustment of a contract for the design, development and fabrication of a Ground Receiver System with Avco Corporation, Electronics Division, of Cincinnati, Ohio, in a total amount approximating \$3,410.08, the exact amount depending upon verification of calculations made by the contractor.

d. Under date of October 25, 1966, the Board authorized the adjustment of the prime contract for the production and delivery of the Apollo spacecraft with North American Aviation, Inc., of Downey, California, in the amount of \$46,000. The adjustment was authorized for the benefit of Central Technology, Inc., of Herrin, Illinois, a subcontractor to North American Aviation, Inc. for 24 docking ring separation systems.

2. Actions under Project Stabilization Agreement applicable to construction work at Cape Kennedy, Florida.

Under date of May 20, 1964, the Administrator of NASA made a determination pursuant to the Act of August 28, 1958 (Public Law 85-804), that, from and after April 1, 1964, all contracts, or amendments or modifications thereof, for the performance of construction work at the Patrick Air Force Base, Cape Kennedy, and the John F. Kennedy Space Center, should include a clause requiring contractors and all subcontractors thereunder to abide by money provisions of a Project Stabilization Agreement, to the extent such money provisions are determined by the Government to be reasonable. The Project Stabilization Agreement referred to is an agreement negotiated by and between the Patrick Air Force Base Contractor's Association and other local and national associations of contractors, and the Brevard Building and Construction Trades Council of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO. The purpose of this agreement is to promote stability, efficiency, and

economy of performance of contracts involving construction work at Patrick Air Force Base and the Cape Kennedy complex. The agreement was originally negotiated in 1962, and re-negotiated for the period beginning April 1, 1964.

On February 5, 1964, the President's Missile Sites Labor Commission found the money provisions of the revised Project Stabilization Agreement to be reasonable for cost reimbursement purposes and recommended that they be authorized for payment on all Government contracts. The determination under P.L. 85-804 made by the Administrator on May 20, 1964, was in implementation of the foregoing recommendation of the President's Commission. Pursuant to this determination, 12 NASA contracts for construction work in the Cape Kennedy area, of a total value of \$946,684, which were awarded or amended during 1966, included the clause making the money provisions of the above Project Stabilization Agreement applicable. While it is possible that inclusion of the clause resulted in some increase in costs under the contracts involved in an amount not readily determinable, the purpose of the Project Stabilization Agreement is to promote the overall stability, efficiency, and economy in performance of the contracts brought under it.

3. Actions under Project Stabilization Agreement applicable to construction work at the Mississippi Test Facility.

Under date of September 26, 1963, the Administrator of NASA made a determination similar to that described in Paragraph 2 above with respect to contracts and subcontracts for construction work at the Mississippi Test Facility, in implementation of a Project Stabilization Agreement which had been negotiated for that area and which expired on June 30, 1966. Pursuant to this determination, seven contracts or amendments to existing contracts for construction work at the Mississippi Test Facility, of a total value of \$1,645,773, which were executed in 1966, included the clause making the money provisions of the Project Stabilization Agreement applicable. Of these seven contracts or contract amendments, five amendments to existing contracts were executed directly by NASA and two new contracts were executed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, under a delegation of authority from the Administrator of NASA. While it is possible that inclusion of the clause resulted in some increase in costs under the contracts involved in an amount not readily determinable, it is noted again that the purpose of negotiating a Project Stabilization Agreement is to promote the overall stability, efficiency, and economy in performance of the contracts brought under it.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

506. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations request involving new obligatory authority (H. Doc. No. 83); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

507. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a notification as required by section 103(d)(3) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

508. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a notification as required

by section 103(d)(3) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

509. A letter from the national quartermaster general, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting a copy of the audit of financial transactions as of September 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-530; to the Committee on Armed Services.

510. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ending December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

511. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report of the location, nature, and estimated cost of an additional facility project proposed to be undertaken for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-188; to the Committee on Armed Services.

512. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight instruction program, covering the period January 1, 1966, through December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

513. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

514. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of January 1967, pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1967, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

515. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the first annual report of the work and operations of the Commission, pursuant to the provisions of section 705(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

516. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of instances wherein the National Aeronautics and Space Administration utilized the authority granted, pursuant to the provisions of 72 Stat. 972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

517. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

518. A letter from the Chairman, National Trust for Historic Preservation, transmitting the 1966 annual report of the National Trust, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-665; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

519. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the boundary of Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

520. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of the

Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

521. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 331 and docket No. 331-A, *The Spokane Tribe of Indians, suing on its own behalf and on behalf of the Upper, Middle and Lower Bands of the Spokane Indians or the Upper Spokane, Middle Spokane, or Lower Spokane Band of Indians, or any one or two of them alternatively*, *Petitioner, v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055 (25 U.S.C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

522. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent terminations of oil and gas leases in cases where there is a nominal deficiency in the rental payment and to authorize him to reinstate under some conditions oil and gas leases terminated by operation of law for failure to pay rental timely; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

523. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report of changes that will occur in the organizational structure of the Interstate Commerce Commission, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-670; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

524. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 52d annual report to the Commission, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

525. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

526. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 9, 1967 the following bills were reported on March 10, 1967:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 2529. A bill to amend the act of September 8, 1960, relating to the Washington Channel waterfront (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6638. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire certain real property in the District of Columbia determined to be necessary for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States or as sites for offices of other international organizations or governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CAREY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5277. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,

and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 3371. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 13, 1967]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7123. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 7054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore the provisions permitting the deduction, without regard to the 3-percent and 1-percent floors, of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals 65 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 7055. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 7056. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 7057. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7058. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 7059. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7060. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians on behalf of the Mississippi Bands and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands of Chippewa Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 7061. A bill to authorize the construction of bridges across the Harvey Canal and the Bayou Segnette in Jefferson Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 7062. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on paper industries machinery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 7063. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual's foster child may in certain cases be treated as his natural child for purposes of determining his entitlement to a personal

exemption for such child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 7064. A bill to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 7065. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to designate airports owned by a State or political subdivision thereof as international airports of entry if the State or political subdivision requests such designation and agrees to provide the facilities and funds necessary for the administration of the customs laws at such airports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 7066. A bill to incorporate the National Counterintelligence Corps Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 7067. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude ambulance drivers and attendants from the minimum wage and overtime compensation provisions of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 7068. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 7069. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7070. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title X thereto which will establish a program to protect adult health by providing assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease, by providing assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers, and by providing assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7071. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the Federal income tax for State and local income taxes paid by an individual during the taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7072. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7073. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the determination of average pay for retirement purposes and the computation of retirement annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7074. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 7075. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 7076. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 7077. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 7078. A bill to provide for equitable

acquisition practices, fair compensation, and effective relocation assistance in real property acquisitions for Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7079. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide assistance for owners and employees of small business concerns displaced or injured by Federal or federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7080. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide for more equitable treatment of persons affected by real property acquisitions in Federal or federally assisted programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 7081. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to exclude from consideration as income, for the purpose of determining eligibility for pension, all amounts paid to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar type plans or programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 7082. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction, or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years, of such expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H.R. 7083. A bill to amend the act of December 22, 1928, relating to the issuance of patents for lands held under color of title, to liberalize the requirements for the conveyance of the mineral estate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 7084. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 7085. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 7086. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 7087. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 7088. 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. LANDRUM:

H.R. 7089. A bill to amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to extend its coverage to certain additional counties; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 7090. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLOREY:

H.R. 7091. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7092. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the admissibility

in evidence of confessions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7093. A bill to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7094. A bill to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7095. A bill to permit the compelling of testimony with respect to certain crimes, and the granting of immunity in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7096. A bill to outlaw the Mafia and other organized crime syndicates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7097. A bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 7098. A bill making a supplemental appropriation to carry out the Adult Education Act of 1966 for the fiscal year 1967; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 7099. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7100. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7101. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7102. 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. PEPPER:

H.R. 7103. 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. 7104. 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. POAGE:

H.R. 7105. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to strengthen and expand food service programs for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 7106. A bill concerning the maximum interest rate; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 7107. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 and the Records Disposal Act of July 7, 1943, to provide for the improved direction and supervision by the President and by the Congress of the foreign intelligence activities and special operations of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 7108. 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. 7109. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7110. A bill to amend section 32(e) of

title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 7111. 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. 7112. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of certain turtle meat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 7113. A bill to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 7114. A bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the interests of consumers; to coordinate the administration of consumer services by transferring to such Department certain functions of the Departments of Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and other agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 7115. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7116. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 7117. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for certain amounts set aside by a taxpayer for the higher education of prospective college students in his family, and a tax credit for certain amounts otherwise paid as educational expenses to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 7118. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that widows of veterans who die while suffering from a total and permanent service-connected disability shall be entitled to dependency and indemnity compensation under that chapter; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.R. 7119. A bill to create a commission on the establishment of a Council of Free Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 7120. A bill to establish an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in the form of direct grants and loans to certain hospitals in critical need of new facilities in order to meet increasing demands for service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7121. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 7122. A bill to amend section 112(c) of title 28, United States Code, to provide that the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York shall be held at Brooklyn, Hauppauge, and Mineola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 7123. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to provide for the resumption of trade with Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.J. Res. 422. 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. EDWARDS of California:

H.J. Res. 423. 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. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 424. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution preserving the rights of the States with respect to public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.J. Res. 425. 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. LUKENS:

H.J. Res. 426. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.J. Res. 427. Joint resolution providing for the preparation and submission to the Congress of a master ground transportation plan for the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.J. Res. 428. Joint resolution to support the other American Republics in a historic new phase of the Alliance for Progress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.J. Res. 429. Joint resolution to support the other American Republics in a historic new phase of the Alliance for Progress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H. Con. Res. 275. Concurrent resolution to provide early appropriations for Federal educational programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. Con. Res. 276. Concurrent resolution to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KARTH:

H. Con. Res. 277. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the support of the Congress for United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 381. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GETTYS:

H. Res. 382. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the resignation of the present Commissioner of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H. Res. 383. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure by Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives of assets and liabilities and relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

57. By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of the House of Delegates, West Virginia Legislature, requesting the West Virginia delegation in Congress to take appropriate action to aid flood victims in West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

58. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to renaming the Tehama-Colusa Canal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

59. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to limiting the quantity of cotton-rayon textile imports and to increase the tariffs thereon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

60. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to the return without restriction to the States of a portion of Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

61. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Federal financial assistance payments to domestic gold producers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

62. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the tax imposed upon slot machines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

63. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to exempting from the highway use tax imposed under 26 U.S.C. 4481, those trucks designated by State law as farm trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

64. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to succession to the Presidency and the Vice Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

65. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the release of moneys withheld from Federal aid highway funds to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. 7124. A bill for the relief of Gaspare Lamarca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 7125. A bill for the relief of Ekaterini Konst Dimopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 7126. A bill for the relief of Peter Ercolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 7127. A bill for the relief of Gilberto Oropa Zapanta and his wife, Lilia Ong Zapanta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 7128. A bill for the relief of Dr. Esther Yolanda Lauzardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 7129. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jawahar N. Ghia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI (by request):

H.R. 7130. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Staropoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 7131. A bill for the relief of the estate of Patrick H. Harrington, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 7132. A bill for the relief of Melbourne Murray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7133. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gulizar Parseyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:
H.R. 7134. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Vorrias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. PUCINSKI:
H.R. 7135. A bill for the relief of George Diamantopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. REID of New York:
H.R. 7136. A bill for the relief of Maria Luigia Di Giorgio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7137. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marcelina Garcia Samson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROBISON:
H.R. 7138. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Sarra Plstone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROONEY of New York:
H.R. 7139. A bill for the relief of Rocco Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS. ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

47. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to representation of the District of Columbia in the U.S. Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 1967

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, as we rejoice at the gift of another day, may its hours be made luminous by Thy presence—who art the light of all our seeing. Incline our hearts to keep Thy law, and in that law may we meditate day and night.

Wherever we are called to stand in this epic hour, may we strike our blow for the truth of God and the freedom of man.

In everything we are called to do, may we be at our best and so to be worthy of our high calling.

Grant us the spirit of kindness, of thoughtfulness, and of fair play in all our relationships. Deliver us from all malice and contempt less we hurt others and sour our own souls.

Hear Thou our prayer as out of the depths we cry as we climb the world's great altar stairs which slope through darkness up to Thee—and in dangerous days may we still be able to utter in glad and grateful confidence, though a host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear.

The Lord is my light and my salvation; the Lord is the strength of my life, of whom should I be afraid. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 10, 1967, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS AS IN LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, as in legislative session, and that each Senator's statement therein be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MEETING OF AMERICAN STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 84)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on the meeting of Latin American States. Without objection, the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States: In less than a month, the leaders of the American States will meet in Punta del Este in Uruguay.

It will be the first such meeting in a decade, and the second ever held, of the heads of the free nations of our hemispheric system.

This meeting represents another link in the bond of partnership which joins us with more than 230 million neighbors to the south.

The gathering is far more than a symbol of flourishing friendship. Its purpose is a review of the progress we have made together in a great adventure which unites the destinies of all of us. Beyond that it will include a common commitment to the historic and humane next steps we plan to take together.

I look to this meeting with enthusiasm. The peaceful and progressive revolution which is transforming Latin America is one of the great inspirational movements of our time. Our participation in that revolution is a worthy enterprise blending our deepest national traditions with our most responsible concepts of hemispheric solidarity.

THE MEASURE OF PROGRESS

The cooperative spirit between the rest of the Americas and the United States has been building for decades.

The establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank in 1959, and the Act of Bogotá in 1960, under the leadership of President Eisenhower, helped turn that spirit to substance. In those historic compacts the American governments pledged their joint efforts to the development of programs to improve the lives of all the people of Latin America. They provided the impetus for an action taken in 1961 on which the history of the hemisphere has since turned. That action—the Alliance for Progress, which moved dramatically forward under President Kennedy—fused old dreams and fired new hopes. With its commitment of mutual assistance and self-help programs, it attacked evils as old as the condition of man—hunger, ignorance, and disease.

That Alliance is now 6 years old.

What can we say of it?

We can say that there is a clear record of progress. Per capita growth rates for Latin America show that more countries have broken the economic stagnation of earlier years. Reform and modernization are advancing as a new wave of managers and technicians apply their skills. There have been steady gains in private, national, and foreign investments. Inflation is easing. The struggle for social justice is proceeding.

These are all true. But the statements of progress are more meaningful, and they more realistically reflect the spirit of the Alliance, when they relate to the people for whose lives the Alliance itself was created. Since the Alliance began, and with the funds that we have contributed:

Men, women, and children are alive today who would otherwise have died.

One hundred million people are being protected from malaria—in 10 countries, deaths caused by malaria dropped from 10,810 to 2,280 in 3 years' time. Small-pox cases declined almost as sharply; 1,200 health centers, including hospitals and mobile medical units, are in operation or soon will be.

For tens of thousands of families, the most fundamental conditions of life are improving.

Three hundred and fifty thousand housing units have been, or are now being, built, 2,000 rural wells and 1,170 portable water supply systems have been built to benefit some 20 million persons.

Children are going to school now who would not have gone before.

Primary school enrollments have increased by 23 percent; secondary school enrollments by 50 percent; university enrollments by 39 percent; 28,000 classrooms have been built; 160,000 teachers have been trained or given additional training; more than 14 million textbooks have been distributed; 13 million school-children and 3 million preschoolers participate in school-lunch programs.

Men whose fathers for generations have worked land owned by others now work it as their own.

Sixteen countries have legislation deal-